

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California State University, Monterey Bay

Professional Services Division

January 31, 2007

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at California State University, Monterey Bay. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Report, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for California State University, Monterey Bay and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION**

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential
 - Multiple Subject
 - Multiple Subject Internship
 - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
- Single Subject Credential
 - Single Subject
 - Single Subject Internship
- Education Specialist Credentials
 - Preliminary Level I
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship
 - Professional Level II
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institutions response to the precondition be accepted.
- California State University, Monterey Bay be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Monterey Bay be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits as appropriate subject to the newly established schedule of accreditation visits by both the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Background Information

California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) first opened its doors in the 1995-1996 academic year with a dedication ceremony that included local, state and national dignitaries including the then Governor of California, Pete Wilson, and President Bill Clinton. The first graduates completed their undergraduate programs in 1999. CSUMB was established as the 22nd of the 23 campuses of the California State University system which is one of the largest systems of higher education in the world. The campus is located in the Monterey Peninsula and Bay region which includes a large rural agricultural area and is a major tourism destination. The campus is located in the central coast of California on 1,365 acres of the old Fort Ord Military Reservation site. After a number of state and community meetings and conferences, the idea of establishing a state university became a reality in 1995 when a CSUMB planning team secured land from Fort Ord for the establishment of the university. The planning team had the support of the California Legislature and CSU Chancellor's Office, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). University planners received funding of \$15 million to support its first two years of operation, hired academic deans, selected a president, evaluated over 6,000 faculty applications, and hired its first faculty.

Today, the university is a state-supported, non-sectarian institution serving 3,500 students at levels ranging from freshman to post-graduate and graduate. A majority of the students are recruited from the surrounding tri-county area consisting of the counties of Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz, with a total population of just over 700,000. Monterey County is the largest of the three, with 400,000 residents; Santa Cruz County has around 250,000 residents and San Benito County's population is just over 50,000. Ethnically, White and Hispanic/Latino groups dominate the area. Whites comprise about 45 percent of the population of San Benito County, 56 percent of Monterey County, and 75 percent of Santa Cruz County; Hispanics/Latinos comprise about 27 percent of the population of Santa Cruz County, 47 percent of Monterey County, and 48 percent of San Benito County. The remaining population consists largely of "Other/Unknown" (20-30%), with smaller groups such as African-Americans (1-4%), Asian/Pacific Islander (2-6%), and American Indian/Alaska Native (1%).

The university strives to reflect and to serve its local population, as put forth in its vision statement:

To build a multicultural learning community founded on academic excellence from which all partners in the educational process emerge prepared to contribute productively, responsibly, and ethically to California and the global community.

To achieve this, the university actively recruits throughout the area, and its student population roughly reflects that of its tri-county population base: White (47%); Hispanic/Latino (28%); Other/Unknown (14%); Asian American/Pacific Islander (6%); African-American (4%); and Native American (1%). As with many other institutions of higher learning in the U.S., there are more female (59%) than male (41%) students. The 282 faculty members also reflect diversity: 60 percent White, 15 percent Hispanic/Latino, 12 percent Asian American/Pacific Islander, 6 percent African American, 6 percent Other/Unknown, and 1 percent Native American. The University offers a variety of programs and majors including 16 undergraduate degree programs, 4 master's degree programs, and 3 post-graduate (credential) programs. It also offers 26 undergraduate minor programs.

School of Education – The Unit

All professional programs of the unit are under the direction and administration of the Dean of the College of Professional Studies who also serves as the Dean of the School of Education.

Since its beginning in 1995-1996, the university has placed a major emphasis on teacher education. The teacher education program was initially called the “Institute for Field-Based Teacher Education” and included only a multiple subjects (elementary education) program which was approved and then accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) in 1999. In 2001, a single subject (secondary) credential program was approved and then accredited by the CCTC. Also, in that same year the CCTC approved a new Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities Credential Program, Level I. In 2003, a new Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disabilities Credential Program Level I was approved. The Level II (advanced) Education Specialist Credential Program, Mild/Moderate Disabilities and Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disabilities were approved in 2002 and 2005, respectively. In addition, both Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate with Internship and Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe with Internship were subsequently approved. The Master of Arts in education program began in 1995 and the doctoral program in education with San Jose State University and the University of California at Santa Cruz was approved in 2004, and began offering courses in 2005. This joint doctoral program is being discontinued.

Department of Teacher Education

The Department of Teacher Education consists entirely of post-graduate and graduate programs. There are three preliminary credential programs, all of which are post-graduate and fifth-year: multiple subjects, single subject (English, Foreign Language [Spanish and Japanese], Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies) and Special Education. There also is a Master of Arts in Education graduate program, which is comprised of two strands: a curriculum & instruction emphasis strand and a special education strand. The special education strand encompasses the induction program for education specialist teachers with preliminary (Level I) credentials; upon completion of this program they are eligible for the professional clear (Level II) Education Specialist credential.

As with the university and the college, the Department of Teacher Education mission focuses on the diversity and multicultural character of the tri-county area:

The Department of Teacher Education prepares caring and responsive educators with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to effectively facilitate the learning of all students from diverse ethnic, linguistic, and ability groups, so that they can fully participate in a dynamic society and world.

The department's credential programs are supported and governed by a university-wide Teacher Education Council (UTEC). The UTEC is organized to represent administrators, faculty, staff, and P-12 professionals (including master teachers and principals) who participate in the preparation of future educators for the university. The UTEC is a recognized committee of the faculty senate for purposes related to curriculum, program review, and program quality, and is recognized by the university president as the governing body with authority and responsibility for teacher education. The UTEC reports its deliberations to the dean of the College of Professional Studies who serves as Chief Institutional Officer for Teacher Education.

Following is the identification of all professional credential programs offered by the unit.

**California State University, Monterey Bay
Credential Programs**

Credential Area	Number of Candidates
Multiple Subjects	28
Multiple Subject Internship	7
BCLAD Emphasis	12
Single Subject	20
Singles Subject Internship	8
Mild/Moderate Disabilities – Level I	167
Moderate/Severe Disabilities – Level I	38
Mild/Moderate Internship Program – Level I	26
Moderate/Severe Internship Program – Level I	21
Mild/Moderate Disabilities – Level II	144
Moderate/Severe Disabilities – Level II	21

Merged COA and NCATE Visit

This was an initial accreditation visit by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and a continuing accreditation visit for the Committee on Accreditation. The visit merged the accreditation processes of the COA and NCATE according to the approved protocol. The merged Accreditation Team included members for the COA and NCATE, received a single Institutional Self-Study Report (Institutional Report), worked from a common interview schedule, and collaborated on all decisions related to all accreditation standards.

The merged visit was based upon the partnership agreement reached between the COA and NCATE. The first partnership agreement was developed and signed in 1989. The Partnership was revised and renewed in 1996 and subsequently revised and renewed in 2001. The

Partnership Agreement requires that all California universities who are NCATE accredited participate in reviews that merged with the State's accreditation process. The agreement allows the university the option to respond to the NCATE 2000 Standards, provided that the Commission's Commission Standards are addressed in the context of the response. It also allows the subsequent accreditation team report to be written based upon those standards. California State University, Monterey Bay exercised that option. In addition, the institution must respond to all appropriate Program Standards. The agreement also states that the merged team will share common information and interview schedules, and will collect data and reach conclusions about the quality of the programs in a collaborative manner. However, the accreditation team will take the common data collected by the team and adapt it according to the needs of the respective accrediting bodies. This is because the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board requires a report that uses the familiar language and format of the NCATE standards rather than the language that is needed for the COA (i.e., information about Common Standards and Program Standards). Under the provisions of the partnership agreement, California universities are not required to submit Folios to the NCATE-affiliated professional associations for review. The state review stands in place of that requirement.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the NCATE unit standards and appropriate references to the California Common Standards. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using Option One, California Program Standards.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the School of Education and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of twelve consisting of a State Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster that would include five NCATE members and two COA members; a Program Cluster of three members. Shortly before the visit, one of the Program Cluster members withdrew from the team and the state consultant and the institution determined to not replace the member. The administrator for accreditation and state consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and training in the use of the *Accreditation Framework* and experience in merged accreditation visits.

The State Team Leader and the Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners served as Co-Chairs of the visit. Each member of the COA/NCATE Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the University's responses to the NCATE Standards/Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for each credential area. The Program Cluster members primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered responses to select areas of the NCATE Standards.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Saturday, November 11, 2006. On Saturday morning, the Team

Leader and the COA members of the Common Standards and CCTC staff began their deliberations with the NCATE team members. It included orientation to the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangement for both the COA and NCATE team members. The Common Standards Cluster began its examination of documents on the campus the rest of Saturday and on Sunday morning. The remainder of the team arrived on Sunday morning, November 12, with a meeting of the team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a poster session and reception on Sunday afternoon to provide an orientation to the institution. This was followed by further meetings of the clusters to prepare for the activities of the next day.

On Monday and Tuesday, November 13 and 14, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The institution arranged to transport members of the team to various local school sites used for collaborative activities. There was extensive consultation among the members of both clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. On Tuesday morning, the team Co-chairs met with institutional leadership for mid-visit status report. This provided an opportunity to identify areas in which the team had concerns and for which additional information was being sought. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. During those work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the NCATE/Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the NCATE/Common Standards, the team made a decision of “Standard Met” or “Standard Not Met.” The team had the options of deciding that some of the standards were “Met Minimally” with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision then noted particular strength beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and concerns beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards pointing out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standard. The team noted particular strengths beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and concerns not rising to the level of finding a standard less than fully met.

The team included some “Professional Comments” at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding of the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decision by the Team

The entire team met on Tuesday evening to review the findings on all standards and make decisions about the results of the visit. The total merged team reached consensus about the

number of concerns, areas for improvement, areas of strengths and identified areas for professional comments. The team found that NCATE Standards 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 were met and its consideration included all aspects of the CTC Common Standards. The team decided that NCATE Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation was not met for NCATE purposes but was met for COA purposes when considering the context and language of CTC Common Standard 4 – Evaluation. The team found that while the “unit” had not fully implemented a comprehensive assessment system at the “unit” level, that the School of Education and all credential programs areas were rich with candidate and program assessment data. Common Standard 4 states that “the institution regularly involves program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses and field experiences, which leads to substantive improvements in each credential program, as needed.” The team found that the institution did involve participants, graduates, and local practitioners in the evaluation of the quality of courses and field experiences and that there was evidence of programmatic changes as a result of the evaluation process. For the remaining NCATE standards, the team identified seven areas for improvement for NCATE purposes. For state purposes, the team decided that Standard Three – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice was met with concerns and Standard Four – Diversity was met with a concern.

The team decided that state program standards were met for all programs, but concerns were identified within elements of four standards for the Multiple Subject Program and four standards for the Single Subject Program. For each of the programs, concerns were expressed about Program Standard 8 – Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction, Program Standard 14 – Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom, Program Standard 16 – Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors, and Program Standard 18 – Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments.

Overall, the team agreed that the institution was providing strong programs of preparation and that even though some concerns were identified, the accreditation decision should be “Accreditation.”

The Team Report was written to provide the COA with team findings for NCATE purposes first and then separate findings for COA purposes. Not all NCATE “areas for improvement” were appropriate for recommending to the COA and certain findings in program areas that are stated as COA “concerns” were appropriate for the COA report.

The team then made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The options were: “Accreditation,” “Accreditation with Technical Stipulations,” “Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations,” “Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations,” or “Denial of Accreditation.” After thorough discussion, the entire team voted to recommend the status of “**Accreditation**”. The recommendation was based on the unanimous agreement of the team and that the overall evidence clearly supported the accreditation recommendation. Following the decision, the team went on to complete the written accreditation report, which was reviewed by the team on Wednesday morning. A draft of the report was presented to the faculty late Wednesday morning.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIAL
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

INSTITUTION: California State University, Monterey Bay

DATES OF VISIT: November 11-15, 2006

ACCREDITATION TEAM

RECOMMENDATION: ACCREDITATION

RATIONALE:

The accreditation team conducted a thorough review of the Institutional Report, the program documents for each approved credential program, and the supporting evidence. In addition, interviews were conducted with candidates in various stages of the programs, program completers who have been in the field for at least one year, faculty, staff and administration of the university, employers of graduates, field supervisors and advisory committee members. Team members obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making judgments about the educator preparation programs offered by the institution.

The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of California State University, Monterey Bay and its credential programs was determined based on the following:

NCATE's SIX STANDARDS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The University elected to use the NCATE format and to write to NCATE's unit standards to meet the CTC Common Standards requirement. There was extensive cross-referencing to the CTC Common Standards. Also, the corresponding part of this team report utilizes the NCATE standards and format. The total team (NCATE and COA members) reviewed each element of the six NCATE Standards, added appropriate areas of the Common Standards, and decided as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with areas of improvement or concern.

PROGRAM STANDARDS CUSTER: Team members reviewed the Multiple and Single Subject Programs – including internship, Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis Program, and Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe – including internship and Level II. Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total merged team membership was held. Following these discussions of each program reviewed, the total team, NCATE and COA considered whether the program standards were either met, met with concerns, or not met.

ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus about the findings on the standards. All elements of the CCTC Common Standards were addressed within the context of the NCATE report institutional report. For the six NCATE standards, the team determined that all standards were met with the exception of Standard Two – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation. For NCATE purposes, the standard was not met with three areas for improvement and for state purposes, the standard was met with a concern. For the remaining standards the team determined that for NCATE purposes, there were seven

areas for improvement identified. For state purposes, the team decided that Standard Three – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice was met with concerns and Standard Four – Diversity was met with a concern.

The team decided that state program standards were met for all programs, but concerns were identified within elements of four standards for the Multiple Subject Program and four standards for the Single Subject Program. For each of the programs, concerns were expressed about Program Standard 8 – Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction, Program Standard 14 – Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom, Program Standard 16 – Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors, and Program Standard 18 – Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments.

Overall, the team agreed that the institution was providing strong programs of preparation and that even though some concerns were identified, the accreditation decision should be “Accreditation.”

ACCREDITATION TEAM MEMBERSHIP

NCATE Team Leader: Carrie Robinson, New Jersey
Co-Chair for the Visit

NCATE Team Members: Virginia L. Robinson, Idaho (NCATE)
Patrick M. Macy, Hawaii (NCATE)
Sue George, Missouri (NCATE)
Larry D. Powers, North Carolina (NCATE)

State Team Leader: Marilyn Draheim, University of the Pacific
Co-Chair for the Visit

State Team Members Mark G. Cary, Davis Joint Unified School District (ret.)
(Common Standards, Multiple Subject/Single Subject)

Charles G. Zartman, Jr., California State University, Chico
(Common Standards, Multiple Subject/Single Subject)

Wanda Baral, Fountain Valley School District
(Multiple Subject/Single Subject)

Sharon Jarrett, Los Angeles Unified School District
(Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe)

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog	Schedule of Classes
Institutional Self Study	Advisement Documents
Course Syllabi	Faculty Vitae
Candidate Files	Portfolios
Fieldwork Handbooks	Candidate Work Samples
Course Materials	Exit Surveys
Information Booklets	Assessment Data
Field Experience Notebooks	Follow-up Survey Results

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Standards	MS/SS Credential	Ed. Spec. Credential	TOTAL
Program Faculty	4	17	17	5	43
Institutional Administration	6	12	4	4	26
Candidates	8	34	41	36	119
Graduates	4	9	21	37	71
Employers of Graduates	1	4	3	9	17
Supervising Practitioners	4	6	8	11	29
Advisors	2	2	3	2	9
School Administrators	3	5	7	11	26
Credential Analyst	1	1	1	1	4
Tech Support	2	2	2	2	8
Advisory Committee	3	3	7	4	17
TOTAL					386

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

STANDARD 1. CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Initial Programs

California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) offers initial credential programs for Multiple Subject (MS), Single Subject (SS), and Education Specialist (ES) Level I (mild/moderate, moderate/severe). All three programs include student teaching and intern options. Coursework in each program is scheduled in such a way that interns and student teachers attend class at the same time and receive the same instruction. Because the unit offers both Education Specialist Level I Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe (an initial credential) and Level II (an advanced program required for attaining a clear Education Specialist credential), several courses are offered during the summer as well as during the school year to accommodate candidates' individual work/study schedules. These include *SP 550*, a summer-intensive course for interns to help prepare them for beginning their teaching assignments.

The conceptual framework addresses the expectation that all candidates meet appropriate knowledge, skills and disposition criteria. For Multiple and Single Subject Programs, this expectation has been translated into practice by 13 Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), based upon the California Standards for the Teacher Profession (CSTP) which are California's version of the INTASC standards. The TPEs that relate specifically to content knowledge state that candidates will:

- demonstrate the ability to teach the state-adopted academic content standards for students in their subject area;
- incorporate specific strategies, teaching/instructional activities, procedures and experiences that address state-adopted academic content standards for students in order to provide a balanced and comprehensive curriculum;
- plan instruction that is comprehensive in relation to the subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students; and
- clearly communicate instructional objectives to students and ensure the active and equitable participation of all students.

The California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) is used to assess basic reading, writing, and math skills. All applicants to initial teacher preparation programs must have a GPA of 2.67 and pass the CBEST prior to program admission. Therefore, 100 percent of candidates who enter the programs in the unit passed this assessment.

Multiple Subject candidates enrolled after July 1, 2004 must pass all three subtests of the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET), which consists of (1) reading, language, literature, history and science (2) science and mathematics, and (3) physical education, human

development, and visual and performing arts. Results from aggregated scores on the CSET report a 100 percent pass rate in reading, language, history/social science, a 100 percent pass rate in science/math, and a 100 percent pass rate in PE, Human Development, Visual/Performing Arts for each of the past three years.

Faculty members reported a variety of other ways in which candidates from the initial teacher preparation programs must demonstrate subject matter competence. These include such requirements as a required grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 or above during each semester for all program courses, class assignments, signature assignments, standardized ratings, and successful observations during field experiences and internships. Data were not provided to document subject matter competence for initial candidates.

Advanced Programs

At the advanced level, the unit offers a Master of Arts in Education degree with specializations in either Special Education or Curriculum and Instruction. This program combines content coursework, research, and the publication of a thesis. Candidate proficiencies in the MAE program are defined by eight “learner outcomes.” These are:

- Critical questioner
- Scholar
- Action researcher
- Educator
- Bilingual communicator
- Technological navigator
- Communicator
- Social Justice Collaborator

These learning outcomes are woven throughout MAE coursework, research, and thesis production. Candidates admitted into the program develop individual learning plans that integrate the learning outcomes with the candidate’s particular research interests.

Along with the Education Specialist Level I credential, the unit offers an Education Specialist Level II credential. Candidates in the MAE Special Education strand and the Education Specialist Level II credential take the same series of content courses with the exception of *MAE 690 Action Research* and *MAE 670 Capstone*—which are specifically designed for research and thesis writing. Descriptions of coursework and instructional outcomes for Special Education in the sections below apply to both the MAE Special Education strand and the Education Specialist Level II credential program unless specifically noted.

Candidates admitted into the Master of Arts in Education program must meet general university requirements for graduate admission, including possession of a Bachelor’s degree in a content area, with a GPA of at least 2.75. The MAE program does not require a teaching credential nor does it lead to a credential. While the program does not have a specific subject matter focus, courses in each of the strands are designed to increase candidates’ content knowledge within a multicultural, inclusionary context.

In the Curriculum and Instruction MAE program strand, three courses relate to content: *MAE 631 Applied Linguistics and Language Acquisition*; *MAE 634 Literacy for Linguistically Diverse*

Learners; and *MAE 636 Culture and Cognition*. In the Special Education MAE program strand, at least five courses center, in part, on content. These include *SP 681 Advanced Behavioral, Emotional, and Environmental Supports for Students with Challenges*; *SP 684 Current and Ongoing Research, Policy, and Practice*, and *SP 686 Leadership, Management, and Communication*.

For both advanced program strands, faculty report that candidates demonstrate mastery of coursework content through specific activities/projects, writing/reflection, fieldwork/clinical practice (Special Education strand), and overall course grades. Ultimate mastery of content in the MAE is demonstrated by the completion of action research culminating in a thesis. The thesis requires a comprehensive review of literature in the area of focus as well as an original research project. The thesis is reviewed by the thesis advisor and at least one additional faculty member. Interviews with program coordinators, faculty, fieldwork supervisors, candidates, graduates, and employers indicate that candidates and graduates in these programs possess the content knowledge required by the MAE program and essential to advanced practice in teaching and learning settings.

B. Content Knowledge for Other School Personnel

CSUMB does not have programs for preparing school personnel other than teachers.

C. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Initial Programs

The conceptual framework states that the professional education unit at CSUMB will “prepare educational professionals who have a commitment to Excellence, Equity, and Ethical Action in their professional practices.” Candidates demonstrate their pedagogical knowledge relative to these concepts through completion of signature assignments aligned with Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE). TPEs are central to the performance review of each candidate. Five of these 13 that are closely related to pedagogical content are included below. With regard to these five areas, candidates must show their knowledge of best practices by demonstrating the ability to:

- Make content accessible
- Engage students
- Develop appropriate practices
- Teach English Learners
- Plan instruction.

These TPEs are assessed relative to pedagogical skills for candidates through the signature assignments. These assignments are completed in courses at designated times throughout the program and serve to insure that all TPEs related to this element have been completed at a target level. Program faculty members have developed rubrics for scoring these signature assignments. Examples of rubrics were available. Data were not available for signature assignments.

Pedagogical content knowledge is demonstrated in the classroom and in field experiences through portfolios, case studies, unit projects, classroom demonstrations, and signature assignments. The California State University conducts a system-wide evaluation of graduates

from each institution in the system. After program completion, initial candidates are expected to participate in this survey regarding the quality of their professional preparation. All programs within the CSU system use a similar survey form to acquire data from both employers and graduates. This survey revealed that in the area of Professional Teacher Preparation, 71 percent of CSUMB graduates rated the overall effectiveness of their professional coursework (K-12) either “I was well prepared” or “somewhat prepared.” Seventy-eight percent reported the quality of field experiences within this range.

Candidates must also pass the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) to receive full Multiple Subject certification. For the 2005-2006 academic year 99 percent of all CSUMB Multiple Subject candidates passed this state-wide assessment. During the 2004-2005 academic year 100 percent of all CSUMB candidates passed the RICA examination. These results speak favorably relative to pedagogical preparation. Interviews with unit faculty members, candidates, graduates, and employers of graduates indicate that CSUMB candidates are well prepared in the area of pedagogical content.

Advanced Programs

While not specifically designed to teach pedagogy, both strands of the MAE program at CSUMB contain coursework that includes a focus on pedagogy. In the Curriculum and Instruction strand, several courses focus on pedagogical content knowledge related to literacy, language acquisition, and linguistic diversity. Candidates develop skill in assessing literacy levels of first- and second-language learners, applying strategies to make content accessible to limited English proficient students, and modifying instructional content and settings to make them more culturally relevant. Candidates in the Special Education strand focus on behavioral and emotional disorders and strategies for providing support in instructional settings, using and interpreting specialized assessment instruments, and on adapting curriculum for specialized student needs.

Candidate proficiency is measured through course assignments, portfolios, reflective journals, case studies, clinical fieldwork (for Special Education Level II), and publication of theses. An examination of documents and interviews with faculty, candidates, and graduates indicates that candidates demonstrate skills and understanding consistent with MAE learning outcomes.

D. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teachers

Initial Programs

Results of the California State University system-wide survey indicate that CSUMB graduates felt quite well prepared to teach in the content areas. Eighty-three percent of the graduates rate themselves as either well prepared or adequately prepared to teach Reading-Language Arts, and 86 percent of the graduates rate themselves as either well prepared or adequately prepared to teach Mathematics.

All candidates in initial programs must meet proficiency relative to each of the signature assignments. However, all candidates do not meet proficiency at the first submission of signature assignments. The chart below documents the passing rates of CSUMB candidates on the initial submission of signature assignments. After receiving professional support from CSUMB faculty mentors, all candidates met proficiency relative to each item.

Table 4 Passage/Proficiency Rates on Signature Assessments

Passage rates/ Proficiency rates on student signature assignments matched to particular TPE that manifest professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills	Multiple "I" Search Child Study	Dev. Approp. Learning Env. Plan	Math Lesson Plans & Reflection	Literacy Lessons	Integrated Unit	Standards-Ach. Work Sample	SDAIE Lesson	ELD Lesson	Lesson Plan Modification	Student Teaching Documents
---	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	--------------	------------	--------------------------	----------------------------

CSTP C. ENGAGING AND SUPPORTING STUDENTS IN LEARNING										
TPE 4: Making Content Accessible			89	94	94	93	94	94	78	
TPE 5: Student Engagement		80		94	94	93			78	
TPE 6: Dev. Appropriate Teaching Practices		80	89	94	94		96	96	78	
TPE 7: Teaching English Learners				94			96	96		
CSTP D PLANNING INSTRUCTION AND DESIGNING LEARNING EXPERIENCES										
TPE 8: Learning about Students	80		89			93	96	96	78	
TPE 9: Instructional Planning		80	89	94	94	93	96	96	78	
CSTP E CREATING AND MAINTAINING EFFECTIVE ENVIRONMENTS FOR STUDENT LEARNING										
TPE 10: Instructional Time		80							78	
TPE 11: Social Environment	80	80								
CSTP F DEVELOPING AS A PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR										
TPE 12: Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations	80									
TPE 13: Professional Growth										

Review of documents and interviews with faculty, candidates, and initial program graduates support the data presented above. Their comments along with the successful first-time passing rate on the signature assignments, and positive survey feedback by graduates, serve to demonstrate a strong professional and pedagogical skill set for CSUMB candidates.

Advanced Programs

Coursework in the MAE and Education Specialist Level II programs focuses on the effective application of content and pedagogical knowledge in educational settings. In the case of the MAE Curriculum and Instruction strand, professional pedagogical knowledge and skills focus on developing curriculum that is meaningful, accessible, and developmentally appropriate to a wide range of learners from linguistically, culturally, and economically diverse backgrounds. The program's focus on serving the traditionally underrepresented families in low-income, rural environments places emphasis on candidates' having a sophisticated understanding of the needs and characteristics of the student population and on being able to meet those needs in an educationally and culturally appropriate manner. Central to this is being able to communicate effectively in more than one language and serve as advocates for the children they serve, as well as having expertise in language acquisition curriculum adaptation. Candidates in the Special Education strand (and Education Specialist II credential program) develop advanced skills in areas such as characteristics of and treatment models for various disorder; management and assessment strategies; instructional strategies for the inclusive classroom; communication skills and collaborative problem solving; and critical review and analysis of current literature. A review of candidate work samples, fieldwork assessments, reflective writing, and completed theses indicates that candidates completing the MAE and Education Specialist Level II programs meet all learning outcomes for the programs. In addition, interviews with program faculty, candidates, fieldwork supervisors, graduates, and employers reveal that CSUMB advanced program graduates display a high level of professional pedagogical knowledge and skills.

E. Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel

CSUMB does not have programs for preparing school personnel other than teachers.

F. Dispositions of All Candidates

The Department of Teacher Education has adopted a set of professional dispositions that are to be acquired by candidates during their study at CSUMB and demonstrated through coursework assignments, fieldwork/clinical practice, and other means. According to the adopted dispositions, professional educators:

- are committed to ethical conduct: fairness, honesty, responsibility, compassion, collaboration, and collegiality;
- believe that all students can and will experience academic success;
- believe that individual differences in learners are assets to be accommodated in the classroom;
- are inclined towards being advocates who identify and strive to eliminate inequities, social injustice, and prejudice as stewards of public education for a just society; and
- reflect on their own practices in a process that leads to continual improvement.

Dispositions are discussed in program coursework and are assessed primarily through signature assignments and fieldwork observations as well as through continuous reflective writing in course and fieldwork. A review of fieldwork observations, student portfolios, work samples, reflective journals, and other evidence indicates that significant attention is paid to dispositions during coursework. Interviews with candidates indicated familiarity with the dispositions and awareness of applying them in their daily practice. Focus on, and assessment of dispositions, however, was not uniform across programs. Specifically, Special Education faculty members acknowledge that dispositions need to be more consistently and explicitly addressed in coursework and field assessments. The new program coordinator has begun work to address this issue.

In one measure of candidate dispositions, the most recent California State University system-wide survey indicated that 79 percent of CSUMB teacher graduates were adequately- or well-prepared to address equity and diversity in K-12 settings.

G. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Initial Programs

Initial program candidates demonstrate their ability to assess student learning, use assessment in instruction, and develop meaningful learning experiences to help students learn through the following TPEs:

- Candidates monitor student learning at key points during instruction to determine whether students are progressing adequately toward achieving the state-adopted academic content standards for students
- Candidates interpret and use a variety of assessments to determine student progress and plan instruction

These expectations are assessed both in coursework and in the field placement. Five signature assignments specifically address such topics as use of assessment in planning lessons for the content areas, discuss student learning relative to stated objectives, and adapt instruction in the inclusive setting for students with special needs.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers and school administrators confirmed that initial candidates are well prepared to develop and use assessments in the classroom. Candidates commented on how they used student assessment to reflect on their own practice. Recent graduates reported in interviews that developing rubrics and using student assessment to guide instruction was an area they felt very comfortable with after graduation. Faculty and cooperating teachers reported that candidates demonstrate this element through the completion of case studies, and by evaluating student work samples to develop meaningful learning experiences. Results from the California State University System-wide exit survey indicate that 79 percent of CSUMB graduates of MS, SS, and ES credential programs responded that they were either well prepared or adequately prepared in their ability to assess and reflect. In addition, employment supervisors assessed that 96 percent of CSUMB graduates in these programs were well- or adequately-prepared to monitor student progress by using formal and informal

assessment methods, and 84 percent of graduates were well- or adequately prepared to assess pupil progress by analyzing a variety of evidence including test scores.

Advanced Programs

Student learning and the emphasis on creating effective learning opportunities for a highly diverse student population are at the heart of the MAE program. In the Curriculum and Instruction strand, candidates focus on literacy and language acquisition skills at an advanced level and develop an advanced understanding of literacy-related assessment tools. In addition, candidates focus on the role of culture in cognition in order to better understand how instruction can be modified to be more accessible in multicultural settings. In the Special Education strand, candidates already possess considerable background in assessment and diagnosis of learning, including formal and informal assessments, norm- and criterion-referenced data, curriculum-based measures, and authentic assessments used to determine students' levels of performance and instructional needs. The Education Specialist Level II coursework builds on this with coursework to increase candidates' communication and management skills and ability to work with families, communities, and other professional school personnel to support student learning. A review of documents including work samples, fieldwork journals and observations, portfolios, and theses—as well as interviews with program faculty, candidates, graduates, fieldwork supervisors, and employers—indicates that graduates of these programs are highly skilled in addressing students' learning needs.

H. Student Learning for Other School Personnel

CSUMB does not have programs for preparing school personnel other than teachers.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Evidence provided by the unit on candidate progress from program entry, through transition points, to program completion, and through follow-up graduate and employer surveys, indicate that candidates possess the requisite content and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions to meet state requirements and unit expectations. Faculty members and unit staff clearly described their expectations for basic and advanced credential candidates. Candidates and graduates confirmed that they learned much from their respective preparation programs, and employers affirmed the strength of the unit's graduates in a wide variety of school roles.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Area for Improvement:

New

All candidates are not familiar with, or assessed on the expected dispositions.

Rationale:

The unit has clearly-defined dispositions for all candidates. However, dispositions are not emphasized to the same extent from program to program.

State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Assessment System

Development of Assessment System

The unit has not established a unit wide assessment system to assess candidate performance and unit operations, however; data on candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions are being systematically collected at the program level and to a limited extent, at the unit level, primarily by the credential analysts and field experience coordinator. According to the IR, interviews with the NCATE Steering committee, several faculty members and documents found in the documents room, discussions concerning the development of an assessment system began with the inception/establishment of the university in 1995-96. According to documents found on the CSUMB website and the Institutional Report, P-12 colleagues, local educators, university administrators, and liberal arts faculty and others representing the broad constituency of the professional education unit participated in those discussions, however; a unit wide assessment system has not been implemented. Upon reviewing documents and formal data reports in the documents room it is apparently clear that a tremendous amount of data has been collected and reported that support the development of an assessment system. It should be noted that data is collected by the unit credential analysts, university admissions officer, field coordinator, and the four program areas existing within the unit. The School of Education offers three credentialing/licensure programs which are: (1) Single Subjects (Social Studies, English, Foreign Language, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies), (2) Multiple Subjects (elementary education), (3) Education Specialist (Mild/Moderate and Levels I and II), and Masters of Education. According to the IR and interviews with faculty, key assessments have been identified by programs. According to the IR and faculty interviews the unit does not have a common set of key assessments where data collection is facilitated, developed, administered, collected and analyzed at the unit level. The driving force supporting data collection is individual programs or departments where data is collected to support candidate assessment at the program level and the unit credential analysts where data is collected to support licensure and compliance issues.

Candidate Proficiencies as outlined in the Unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards

According to the IR and the Conceptual Framework document, the conceptual framework program theme is "Education for Excellence, Equity and Ethical Action," referred to by some faculty as the 'three E s'. The conceptual framework according to the conceptual framework document is aligned to and based upon the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) which are used to derive the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) proficiencies. The CSTP have six standards that are aligned to Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). The unit has added one additional standard to the CSTP to facilitate the accomplishments of unit,

university and program goals. The unit has aligned the CSTP standards to INTASC, NBPTS and the TPE proficiencies. Additionally, the unit Education Specialist Level II program at the advanced level is aligned to the CSTP, as well as program standards. Matrices were available in the documents room and the IR to show all of the alignments indicated above. In its efforts to develop a unit assessment system the unit has strategically aligned all of its programs to institutional, state and national standards that are assessed at the program level.

Key Assessments/measures used to monitor candidate performance

Individual programs have identified and implemented a number of different key assessments used to assess candidate performance. The following list summarizes the key candidate assessments used by the unit's programs.

- Verification of undergraduate degree
- Cumulative GPA 2.76 & 3.0
- California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST)
- California Subjects Examinations for Teachers (CSET)
- Candidate Interview
- Application Essay Writing Sample
- No Grade Lower Than 2.0
- Stage I Student Teaching
- Portfolio (various stages)
- Mid-Term Evaluation of Student Teacher by University Supervisor, Cooperating Teacher
- Required signature assignment on all TPE's
- Evidence regarding dispositions
- Pass Reading Instruction Competency Tests
- Capstone Presentation and Exit Surveys

The assessments indicated above comprise those assessments utilized by programs and in some instances the unit to assess candidate matriculation/progress through the programs. According to the IR, faculty interviews, and available documents, programs do not use all the same assessments, however; individual programs utilize any number of the assessments indicated above with respect to individual program structure. The assessments used by each program are identified in the programs transition points.

According to the IR, interviews with faculty and program coordinators, and on-site documents, key assessments are utilized to create transition points for all programs. These assessments are used from admission through program completion. According to the IR, and interviews with program coordinators, faculty systematically meet with candidates at the end of each academic term and continuously throughout the term to monitor and assess their progress. Candidates not making satisfactory progress are provided with interventions and correctives as a condition for continuation. When candidates cannot meet program benchmarks they are counseled out of the program according to the IR and documents reviewed.

Process the unit adopted to ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias.

According to the IR, the unit ensures that candidate assessments are fair and free from bias, faculty “read and review student assignments in portfolios and discuss their use of rubrics and how they made judgments regarding student work.” Upon reviewing documents and interviewing faculty there was no evidence that faculty formally developed validity and reliability of instruments used to assess key candidates assessments at the unit level. There was no evidence of inter-rater reliability coefficients for any of the rubrics reviewed.

Predictors of Candidate Success

There was no evidence that the unit utilized data from key assessments to determine if they could predict candidate success in every program. It should be noted that voluminous data were available on site. It was determined that the data were collected primarily at the program level and some data were collected at the university, unit and California State University System (CSU) level, all of which were available in the documents room.

Use of Assessments and Evaluations to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit

The unit has identified various assessments that are used to address unit operations. According to the IR, on site documents, interviews with the USMCB NCATE Steering committee and unit faculty the following data are collected, summarized, analyzed and reported on unit operations. “The following table identifies the particular kind of unit operations data that is collected, the office responsible for receiving or collecting the data, and the means by which the data is brought to faculty for decision making” (Institutional Report, 2006).

Table 5 Unit Operations

Unit Operations data or report	Responsible recipient	Mode of communication in May of each year
CSU system-wide data	Dean of CPS	To Dept. Chair, to faculty
RICA and CSET results	Credential Analyst	To Dept. Chair, to faculty
Student mid-point and exit survey	Coordinator of Field Placement	To Dept. Chair, to coordinators, to faculty

B. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Timeline for Data Collection

Data for candidate assessment is collected by the credentials analyst, program coordinators, (Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, and Masters of Education) field coordinator, university admissions, faculty, support staff, and faculty advisors. A plethora of data is collected by a variety of persons and offices from throughout the program and university. Data are collected from internal and external sources, to include candidate assessments and unit operations. The Table 6 below identifies some examples of data collected and the person responsible for collecting the data.

Table 6 Data Collection

	Data	Person(s) responsible
A D M I S S I O N	Undergraduate degree complete 2.67 GPA	University Admissions; Program coordinator and support staff
	CBEST attempted (basic skills) CSET passed (Subject matter competency) Interview Letters of recommendation Application essay and writing sample	Program coordinator, faculty, and support staff
	Health clearance (TB) Live Scan clearance	Credentials analyst
GO FROM STAGE I TO STAGE II	CBEST passed 3.0 GPA, no incompletes, and no grade below 2.0 in Stage I of program	Program coordinator, faculty

Table 7 Data Collection

	Data	Person(s) responsible
	Stage I student teaching passed	Field coordinator, program coordinator
CLEARED FOR FULL-TIME STUDENT TEACHING	Stage I portfolio completed, with acceptable narrative	Faculty advisor, program coordinator
	Satisfactory evaluation from University supervisor and cooperating teacher	Field coordinator, program coordinator
PROGRAM COMPLETION	3.0 GPA, no incompletes, and no grade below 2.0 in Stage II of program	Program coordinator, faculty
	Successful completion of full-time student teaching	Field coordinator, program coordinator
	Portfolio satisfactory	Faculty advisors, program coordinator
RECOMMEND FOR A CREDENTIAL	Completed all program requirements	Program coordinator, credentials analyst
	Pass RICA	Credentials analyst
	Complete credential application and meet with credentials analyst	

The CSU system conducts a system wide survey of program completers. This data is compiled, analyzed, and reported to the dean of the education department. According the NCATE Steering committee, some of this data are embargoed for internal use only; the dean selectively shares this information with program coordinators.

Unit Analysis of Data

Data at the unit level are primarily collected, summarized and analyzed by the Credential Analyst and the field coordinator. Data collected by the Credential Analyst include standardized tests results (CBEST, CSET RICA), admissions monitoring data, GPA compliance, health (TB) and Live Scan clearance (fingerprint). Data identified above are reported to the dean of education in summary form indicating numbers, percentage, pass rates for tests and longitudinal type reports. The credential analysts also provide summary reports to the program coordinators, the provost, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the federal government in the form of Title II report compliance. Data are reported in the form of tables and charts. Data collected by the field coordinator are generated from field placements of interns and student teachers. These data are usually reported in the form of Likert rating scaled and percentages. The source of field coordinator data are cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and candidate self ratings. Data are also collected by program coordinators and faculty. According to interviews with the NCATE Steering committee, faculty and documents in the documents room the vast preponderance of candidate assessment data are collected at the program level. According to the IR and faculty interviews the determinant of when data are collected depends upon the type of data. For example, most summative candidate data are collected during the spring when the academic year ends. Additionally, some data are collected each semester and continuously during course offerings. For example, signature assignments are collected during the term as the data are developed. Signature assignment data is collected by individual faculty to verify candidate acquisition of specific knowledge, skills or dispositions and is collected during the course. The credential analyst has the primary responsibility for collecting, analyzing and storing data at the unit level.

Albeit decentralized, a number of technologies are used to collect, analyze and report data for candidate assessment and unit operations. The university student information management system “Banner” is used to collect various types of candidate data. Filemaker Pro database is used by the credential analyst and numerous desktop computers in offices of program coordinators and individual faculty are used to collect, analyze and prepare data reports.

According to the IR and documents in the documents room the unit has a well established system for addressing candidate complaints. This was confirmed by the conceptual framework document and the Standard 2 document in the documents room. However, the reviewers were not able to retrieve/review documents to confirm that the unit kept records of candidate complaints.

C. Use of Data for Program Improvement

Candidate proficiencies are currently assessed in the individual courses and individual programs. Because of the decentralization of data collection and analysis at the program level, some programs are making better use of data than others. As the unit continues to develop its assessment system, faculty indicate that a more systematic approach to the unit-wide assessment of candidate proficiencies will be put in place. It was evident that candidates enrolled in specific programs are regularly assessed in all individual courses and in most programs at the initial level. Less evident was the extent to which candidate proficiencies are regularly assessed at the advanced level. At the present time, faculty in some programs within the unit, primarily those serving candidates at the initial level, have collected data for several semesters based on signature assignments that are aligned with state and institutional standards. In addition, faculty in some programs, again primarily those serving initial candidates, have used course data and, to

a limited extent, program data, to make decisions about program revision/improvement. An issue not yet addressed by the unit is the relationship between NCATE's key assessments in the unit assessment system and CSUMB's signature assessments embedded in individual programs.

The University Teacher Education Council (UTEC) is the policy making body for the university teacher education programs, therefore, data is presented to this body to initiate program change at the unit level. According to UTEC minutes and interviews with the NCATE Steering committee when data are presented to the body, they are discussed and appropriate policy and procedural changes are implemented. However, evidence presented during the on site visit suggests that the preponderance of data for program improvement were generated at the program level. It is also apparent that many discussions concerning the use of program data to inform decisions occur primarily at the program level and take place in small informal groups.

Individual programs within the unit have made many substantial programmatic changes resulting from data collection, and analysis primarily at the program level. The following table outlines examples of problems identified by data analysis at the program level and the subsequent programmatic change resulting from the data.

Table 8 Data Driven Program Changes

Recommended action	Source of recommendation	Resolution
Modified curriculum by adding an additional course of Literacy, test preparation assistance, improved instruction	Candidate exit program evaluations; early low results on the RICA	In late 1999 after the first RICA results came in and students expressed unhappiness with reading instruction, curriculum change, extra curricular support, and personnel changes were made to improve reading instruction and RICA pass rate
Remove redundancy in curriculum	Candidate exit program evaluations	Students complained of redundancy in courses, particularly in foundations courses and bilingual education courses
Recommended action	Source of recommendation	Resolution
Coordinate assignment due dates across courses, modify course requirements	Candidate exit program evaluations	Faculty agreed with the student perception that there were too many assignments due too close together in time and with redundant expectations
More attention to the uses of technology	CSU system wide evaluation and expectations of new 2042 standard	A technology course was added to the curriculum. Students with prior technology learning can challenge the course
Redesign of Field Assessments and Portfolio specifications and introduction of Signature Assignments to demonstrate TPE's.	CTC Program Accreditation Standards; faculty	Program self-study to identify where TPE's are addressed, redesign field instruments, portfolio specifications, and Signature Assignments with rubrics.

Include additional information on classroom management and discipline	CSU system-wide assessment of alumni, Office of Field Placement student assessment process	Students stated dissatisfaction with amount of information and practical value of information provided in the area of classroom management
Enhance candidate abilities to meet needs of English Language Learners	CSU system wide evaluation, faculty review of portfolio	Courses in curriculum and instruction will include enhanced instructional methods for these students
Enhance candidate abilities to provide for special needs students	CSU system wide evaluation, faculty review of portfolio	Current course work in inclusionary instruction will be enhanced by subject-specific accommodations and adaptations
Enhance reading in the content area and reading instruction for struggling readers in secondary schools	CSU system wide evaluation, faculty review of portfolio	Instruction in reading will be enhanced to include both these areas of concern
More attention to the uses of technology	CSU system wide evaluation and candidate exit program evaluations and other candidate feedback	Program self-study of curriculum (to be addressed in Fall 2006)
Redesign of Field Assessments and Portfolio specifications and introduction of Signature Assignments to demonstrate TPE's.	CTC Program Accreditation Standards; faculty	Program self-study to identify where TPE's are addressed, redesign field instruments, portfolio specifications, and Signature Assignments with rubrics.

According to the IR, interviews with NCATE Steering committee and faculty, faculty advisors are the principal vehicle by which individual candidate data are shared with candidates. Faculty advisors meet with individual candidates at the end of each term and at the end of each transition point and/or program stage to inform them of their progress through the program. On site documents were reviewed to confirm candidate data was being shared at specific transition points during the program. Additionally, on-site records revealed that when candidates were not able to satisfy program requirements they were provided assistance and or counseled out of the program. Since the unit is relatively small, formal and informal discussions are a recurring and continuous part of the faculty culture.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit does not have an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs. It was evident that the individual programs offered by the unit collect and analyze data. The analysis of data and the use of data for program improvement seem

to vary significantly by individual program. Less clear was how the unit determined if key assessments are predictors of candidate success. Additionally, it was not evident what steps had been taken by the unit to eliminate bias, test for fairness, accuracy, and consistency in the use of key assessments within and across programs.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Not Met

Areas for Improvement:

New

The unit does not have an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate the unit and improve the unit and its programs.

Rationale

Evidence was provided to demonstrate the collection and analysis of data on applicant qualification, candidate and graduate performance, and individual programs. However, the unit has not yet developed a comprehensive unit-wide assessment system that collects and analyzes data on application qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations *to evaluate the unit and improve the unit and its programs*.

New

Assessments are not predictors of candidate success.

Rationale

The unit has not determined whether its assessment measures are predictors of candidate success.

New

The unit does not maintain formal records of candidate complaints and their resolutions.

Rationale

The unit did not provide data on candidate complaints and their resolutions.

State Team Decision: Standard Met with a Concern

Concern:

Although a grievance process is evident, the unit does not maintain formal records of candidate complaints and their resolutions. Although the NCATE findings indicate this standard to be not met, the institution meets language and intent of the state evaluation standard (Common Standard Four).

STANDARD 3. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

The University-wide Teacher Education Council (UTEC) was organized as a university-wide enterprise. Its primary functions are the evaluation of program effectiveness and the development of policies and resources for the improvement of teacher education. The UTEC faculty, administrators, and community college representatives at CSUMB, K-12 public school faculty, administrators, and community college representatives are also members of the council. The administration has identified the UTEC as the policy recommending body for teacher education at CSUMB. UTEC previously held meetings biannually, but has recently changed to monthly meetings to address the needs of the teacher education program. This group, along with the contracted school partnerships of the tri-county area, comprises the collaborative group who participates in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences.

Sub-committees within UTEC address specific needs/interests for the teacher education program. The charge to the curriculum committee is to identify curriculum needs based on findings of the program evaluation committee and changes in policy and regulations governing teacher education in the State of California. The charge to the program evaluation committee is to develop and recommend policy for the evaluation of credential and degree programs in teacher education. This committee is also charged with the responsibility for monitoring program responses to evaluation findings for the purpose of assuring continuous improvement in the curriculum. The charge to the community service committee is to explore opportunities for public school and related agency support by faculty, staff, students, alumni, and stakeholders of teacher education at CSUMB. The purpose of this committee is to assure proper university participation on important committees and task forces working for the improvement of public education in the tri-county service area: Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz.

UTEC has addressed such issues as:

- How can teacher education ensure that candidates are really prepared for jobs within their districts? Committee members looked at how districts/counties will assist CSUMB in maximizing its effectiveness in training teachers.
- What should the role be in supporting beginning teachers? Issues were raised to not only assist in clearing credentials, but actually helping them strengthen their teaching skills and their resolve to remain in the classroom.
- UTEC sees the required fifteen week field placement as an issue. The committee encourages student teachers to extend their field experiences to encompass both the first and last days of schools, and will credit the total number of hours during the semester.

- Due to preparation programs receiving the lowest rating from 2004 credential program graduates and their employers, the committee created goals as targets for improvement to begin with the 2006-2007 academic year: effectiveness of multiple subject credential program, preparation to manage instruction, preparation to teach young children, and preparation to teach high school students.

UTEC partners are not directly involved in determining student teacher and internship placements, as this responsibility directly lies with the teacher preparation program. However, the unit does work closely with the contracted partnerships to determine student teacher and internship placements. It is the responsibility of the field placement coordinator to select appropriate school sites within these partnerships. The field placement coordinator contacts the specified school principal with possible candidate placements. The two collaborate to find the perfect ‘fit’ for the candidate as well as the cooperating teacher. Interviews confirmed such collaboration is in place between the partner schools and the unit to create the best field experience for both the student teacher as well as the cooperating teacher.

B. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

For the initial credential multiple subjects program, the field experiences begin with placements in the first week of the semester and last through the P-12 academic year. Experiences begin with classroom observation and increase in duration and intensity, culminating in a two-week solo teaching experience in the final five weeks of the second semester. For candidates in the single and multiple subject programs, applicants must have had a pre-requisite field experiences with youth of fifty hours duration. This documented experience must be supervised and evaluated, and must include students of diverse, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Once accepted, candidates in the single subject program are placed into Supervised Student Teaching, Special Topics, and Seminar. Candidates are then placed into secondary school settings for a minimum of four hours every day as they complete unit coursework. During the second semester candidates undertake student teaching experiences of greater duration and intensity. The last five weeks of student teaching is full time, which includes a two week solo.

Competencies for the Special Education Levels I and II are comprised of course-related early field observations/experiences, demonstrations, and observations; along with student teaching or internship. Candidates have one semester of supervised field experience, and are required to participate in seminars concurrent with their field experiences. The Master of Arts in Education candidates are currently P-12 teachers and are fully-credentialed teachers within their own, self-selected classrooms. The program does not have a clinical placement component.

The multiple and single subject programs have identified proficiencies that manifest achievement of California’s Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE). TPE’s, which are tied closely with the conceptual framework as well as program standards, are assessed through three measures: 1) a system-wide survey of program alumni and their employers, 2) California’s Title II examination reporting requirements focusing on the CSET and RICA examinations, and 3) the unit’s system of signature assignments to assess achievement in major outcome products. Signature assignments are performance-based requirements in each course taken.

The field experience evaluation system includes assessment items focused on the candidate's ability to demonstrate growth and achievement of skills, knowledge, and dispositions in the classroom that are tied to student success and to helping all students learn. Specific items, found on the mid-point and summary evaluation forms are indicative of the observations of candidate performance which link to student success and inclusion of all learners in the instructional process. The following items address the three E's of the conceptual framework - Excellence, Equity, and Ethical Action:

1. Know and understand the subjects of the curriculum as his grade levels
2. Organize and manage a class or a group of pupils for instructional activities
3. Organize and manage student behavior and discipline satisfactorily
4. Prepare lesson plans and make prior arrangements for class activities
5. Use an effective mix of teaching strategies and instructional activities
6. Maintain positive rapport and foster students' motivation and excitement
7. Think about problems that occur in teaching and try out various solutions

It is evident candidates are taught to use computer-based technology in the classroom through *ED 538 Technology in the Classroom*. Candidates are also asked to utilize various forms of technology within their credentials course as they are required to seek, analyze, and evaluate potential teaching lessons from the internet, with respect to state standards, academic content, and applicability to diverse student populations. Interviews and classroom observations confirm candidate's knowledge and ability to utilize such technology. Interviews with candidates confirmed that they have access to use specific technology equipment. However, a limited number of candidates have taken advantage of this resource during their field/clinical experience, based on interviews. Classroom observations and interviews conveyed a sporadic visibility of technology at school sites, which could contribute to the lack of technology tools being checked out for use. This creates a discrepancy if the unit systematically ensures that all candidates have opportunities to use technology as an instructional tool during their field experience and clinical practice.

The advanced program encourages the candidate to take *MAE 638, Technology as a Tool for Creativity in the Multicultural Classroom*. This particular class enhances the ability to access information to communicate, and as a means of curricular and pedagogical support for higher level thinking. The majority of the candidates interviewed were able to test out of the course, due to their previous experience/knowledge of technology. These candidates were not aware of a check-out system for borrowing technology tools, and have never made use of this service. Currently, there are no indicators that the unit systematically ensures the candidate's use of technology as an instructional tool during their clinical practice.

School district partners (which include principals and human resource professionals) collaborate with the Office of Field Placement in the identification of sites and cooperating teachers. In general, cooperating teachers are selected on the basis of the following criteria:

1. They hold an appropriate teaching credential. (state requirement)
2. They have expressed a desire to grow professionally through the exchange of ideas with the student teacher and through opportunities offered by the unit.
3. They are sensitive to the needs of a beginning teacher.
4. They are skilled in communicating expectations, rationales for decisions, and evaluations of teaching.

5. They are committed to modeling a system of classroom management for the student teacher.
6. They are willing to meet regularly with the student teacher to plan lessons and then to provide feedback on the observed lessons.
7. They have at least three years of successful full-time teaching experience. (state requirement)
8. They teach in linguistically and/or culturally diverse classroom.

Each semester, principals receive communication regarding criteria for selecting cooperating teachers by the field placement officer. Teachers considered for this role are asked to complete a self-assessment for reading instruction competence to assure that essential skills and strategies of a well-balanced and comprehensive reading program will be conveyed to the student teacher (as outlined in the cooperating teacher's handbook). When the districts identify qualified professionals that meet program expectations, training is provided during the first quarter of the academic year. New cooperating teachers are also provided with an on-site orientation to review handbook expectations and completion of forms; thus becoming an experienced, qualified cadre of cooperating teachers. However, interviews presented a different point of view. Cooperating teachers did not appear to be aware of all the criteria involved in becoming a master teacher. In some instances, they were chosen by the principal, while in other instances cooperating teachers filled out a short form asking if they would like a student teacher for the coming year. These teachers were assigned a candidate by their school principal. According to interviews, once assigned, some cooperating teachers did not complete the required self-assessments. Nor were they trained as outlined in the handbook. Instead, the handbook of expectations and completion of forms were handed to them by the faculty supervisor on their first visit to the school site, thus qualifying them as an experienced cadre of cooperating teachers. In other cases, cooperating teachers stated they filled out a form identifying their qualifying experiences to accept a student teacher for the current academic year. A limited number of cooperating teachers attend any sort of training, provided by the unit, due to scheduling conflicts. The interpretation by both the field placement officer as well as the cooperating teachers was that completing such paperwork and participating in the training was not deemed necessary since they have been a part of the partnership for many years. Due to this discrepancy, it is unclear if the criteria are followed as outlined.

Professional development activities for clinical supervisors are varied. Internship programs do have funding allotted to send clinical supervisors to training sessions. Due to current lack of funding elsewhere, many faculty members receive current research materials. The Field Placement Office and current faculty supervisors have continued supportive contact to detect possible problems with their student interns. Such issues are discussed and resolved through phone conversations. Many faculty members pay for their own professional development training to prepare themselves as clinical supervisors. This was documented sporadically through the faculty vitae, thus making it unclear if there is adequate professional development activities provided for clinical faculty members to prepare them for roles as clinical supervisors.

The responsibility of the clinical faculty to provide regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing advanced-level programs, and other interns are as follows:

- Attempt to know each student teacher as an individual so that suggestions and comments can be personalized and individualized.

- Attempt to become familiar with the needs of the student teacher and students of the assigned classrooms, in order to provide specific assistance.
- Help establish and maintain good relations with area administrative, supervisory, and teaching personnel.
- Inform student teachers about the policies of the student teaching program.
- Help cooperating teachers in guiding student teachers through a successful and rewarding teaching experience.
- Hold conferences with student teachers and mentor teachers and meet with administrative and supervisory personnel as needed.
- Observe the student teacher in all areas of his/her work in order to improve effectiveness in the classroom and evaluate his/her performance.
- Work cooperatively with cooperating teacher in the evaluation of the student teacher and the student teaching program.
- Assist the student teacher in gaining meaningful school-wide experiences during students teaching.
- Encourage the student teacher using the same End-of-the-Semester form used by the Cooperating Teacher.
- Provide support to help alleviate the tension and stress that often accompanies student teaching.

Candidates on the initial and advanced level report they have received regular and continuous support from clinical faculty. Candidates are given not only the professor's e-mail, but often times their home phone as well as their cell phone number.

C. Candidates' development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn

Based on last year's data, the number of candidates eligible for clinical practice each semester exceeds the numbers of candidates who complete successfully.

Table 9 Candidate Eligibility Verses Completers (2005 – 2006)

Credential	Eligibility	Completions	Percentage
Multiple Subject	93	90	96%
Single Subject	42	31	74%
Special Education	71	62	87%
TOTAL	206	183	88%

Assessments during field experiences and clinical practice are conducted mainly by the cooperating teacher. This includes frequent observations, with at least one formal observation weekly; to follow up with a post-observation conference and written feedback. The cooperating teacher is the major source of evaluative feedback. However, clinical supervisors do visit periodically, with at least three visits during Stage I and five visits during Stage II of student teaching. A required formal mid-term evaluation is performed, which provides as a benchmark

for planning the remainder of the semester. During the last two weeks of the semester, a cumulative evaluation form is filled out by the cooperating teacher. The unit's field supervisor then determines the final grade for the candidate's teaching experience based on the cumulative evaluation as well as his own observations. The candidate is expected to prepare an exit assessment of growth and achievement regarding 1) theory and pedagogical thinking, 2) a repertoire of classroom teaching, problem-solving, and management skills and 3) communication skills. This is accomplished through the Teaching Progress and Achievement Portfolio to demonstrate that 1) candidate has mastered the state's performance expectations for teachers and is ready to enter the teaching profession, and 2) to foster reflection on and understanding of the teaching in general, and the development of his own teaching expertise and style in particular on the part of the credential candidate. This portfolio is presented to a panel of educational professionals as a capstone activity, using a poster presentation, to demonstrate competencies relative to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the California Teacher Performance Expectations.

Assessment in all aspects of the MAE program, including coursework and field-based action research, rests on eight major program outcomes, which demonstrates candidate knowledge of and ability to use the most appropriate culturally responsive practices that support complex and challenging learning and development of all candidates. Candidate performance is assessed primarily through coursework, and to some extent through the action research. For this reason, assessment is conducted by the faculty who teach these courses although candidates are encouraged to use their action research projects as a form of self-assessment.

Based on the *Guidelines for Master Teacher and Site Administrators*, the candidate is responsible for maintaining a journal or a log related to the field experience. The candidate is also responsible for providing and submitting written reflections of the university supervisor's observation. Candidate portfolios contain a compilation of reflective writing experiences, evaluations with feedback, and analysis of practice, evaluation, and future modifications during field and/or clinical practice. Portfolios also contain a summary reflection of their field experience/clinical practice. Interviews and classroom observations confirmed continued reflection and feedback within all coursework. Letters of recommendation (noted within portfolios) include positive comments toward candidates and their strength to reflect on own work, and seeking to improve aspects of teaching by the next lesson.

Advanced candidates are encouraged to design, implement, and assess action research within their field settings. Program faculty assist by helping them learn to analyze critically including an in-depth analysis of their own teaching practices resulting in identification of specific changes targeted at enhancing those practices. As they conduct their action research within their field settings, candidates are provided with extensive opportunities for reflection and feedback, primarily by their faculty advisors as well as their peers as they write their action thesis.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit and its school partners design, deliver, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice to help candidates develop their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. They jointly determine specific placement of student teachers to provide appropriate learning experiences. It is unclear as to how the unit systematically ensures that candidates have opportunities to use technology as an instructional tool during their field experiences/clinical practice. Documented evidence suggests that not all clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals, and that some clinical supervisors do not receive adequate professional development activities to prepare them for roles as clinical supervisors. Entry and exit criteria do exist for candidates in clinical practice. Assessments used in clinical practice are linked to candidate competencies delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Both field experience and clinical practice allow time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Areas for Improvement

New:

The unit does not systematically ensure candidates have opportunities to use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences or clinical practice.

Rationale:

There is little or no evidence in some programs in the unit that candidates have the opportunity to use technology in field experiences and clinical practices.

New:

The unit does not consistently apply policies on qualifications, training, and professional development for clinical faculty who supervise field and clinical experiences.

Rationale:

The unit has clearly outlined criteria for selecting and training accomplished school professionals. However, the unit does not utilize its selection criteria and ensure that all clinical faculty are trained. In addition, the unit does not provide professional development activities for clinical faculty members to prepare them for their roles as clinical supervisors.

State Team Decision: Standard Met with Concerns

Concerns:

There is no system in place to ensure that candidates in all credential programs have opportunities to use technology in field experiences and clinical practice.

The institution does not utilize its selection criteria to ensure that all clinical faculty are trained. Also, the unit does not provide professional development activities for all clinical faculty members.

STANDARD 4. DIVERSITY

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Central to the mission of California State University at Monterey Bay is serving the linguistically, culturally, and ethnically diverse population of the three-county area surrounding the campus. This mission influences all programs in the unit. Candidates in initial credential programs must demonstrate proficiency in 13 Teaching Performance Expectations, several of which specifically relate to diversity. These include using developmentally appropriate teaching practices, making content accessible to students, and teaching English Learners. CSUMB has identified an additional proficiency which requires that students plan and implement an inclusive, multicultural, and assets-based curriculum.

Specific coursework focused on diversity in the Multiple Subject program includes ED 612 (Pedagogy for Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students), ED 616/617 (Language and Literacy Development Across the Curriculum), and SP 560 (Inclusionary Practices for Students with Special Needs). Courses covering the same concepts, but targeted toward secondary students, are included in Single Subject coursework. In addition to SP 560 and ED 616/617, candidates in the Education Specialist program are required to take SP 564 (Formal/Informal Assessment for Diverse Students Populations) and SP 568 (Methodologies for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students with Learning Challenges). Candidates in the MAE Curriculum and Instruction strand take MAE 631 (Applied Linguistics and Language Acquisition); MAE 634 (Literacy for Linguistically Diverse Learners); and MAE 636 (Culture and Cognition); while those in the Special Education strand take SP 681 (Advanced Behavioral, Emotional, and Environmental Supports for Students with Challenges); SP 684 (Current and Ongoing Research, Policy, and Practice), and SP 686 (Leadership, Management, and Communication).

Candidates in initial programs are assessed on proficiencies related to diversity through coursework assignments, fieldwork observations, and personal reflection. Assignments include creating a developmentally-appropriate learning environment plan, math and literacy lesson plans with reflection, English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) lessons, and lesson plan modifications for students with special needs. All candidates must demonstrate proficiency on these signature assignments in order to complete initial programs. Results of California State University System-wide surveys of employment supervisors of teaching graduates of CSUMB indicate that 79 percent are adequately to well prepared to meet the instructional needs of students who are English language learners, 83 percent meet the instructional needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds, and 71 percent meet the instructional needs of students with special learning needs. As part of fieldwork in all initial programs, candidates receive feedback from supervisors on their efforts to meet the needs of diverse students.

B. Experiences Working With Diverse Faculty

There are 12 full-time teacher education faculty in the department. There are four males and eight females. Five faculty are Caucasian (42%), five Latino(a) (42%), one African-American (8%) and one Native American (8%). The total CSUMB campus faculty has 55 percent females, 45 percent males, 59 percent Caucasian, 17 percent Latino(a), 17 percent African-Americans, 11 percent Asian American, one percent Native American, and six percent Others or No Response.

Cooperating teachers reflect the diversity of the area. In the three primary districts (Monterey Peninsula, North Monterey Peninsula Unified, Alisal Union) used for field experiences, the gender groups average 73 percent females, 27 percent males; 70 percent Caucasian, 19 percent Latino(a); three percent African-American; two percent Native American; and four percent Others or No Response.

Candidates have the opportunity to interact with diverse faculty in the teacher education program as well as faculty from across campus through their coursework. While in field experiences, candidates work with cooperating teachers from a variety of diverse backgrounds.

Through a variety of grants, faculty demonstrate knowledge and experiences to prepare candidates to work with diverse students. Faculty have developed learning communities to motivate students to complete the credentialing process. This will be done in community college and high schools as well as the CSUMB campus. In another grant project partnerships formed with area school districts will allow future educators to complete the teacher education program to teach in high need areas in urban and rural settings. A third grant will provide access for minority and disabled teachers to a university teacher preparation program. It is intended that these teachers return to their communities to teach special education.

In addition to the acquisition of grants, faculty have published several works relating to diversity and working with diverse students. They have also had experiences in bilingual education, teaching on Native American Reservations and faculty have lived and worked in other countries.

The Office of Academic Personnel Services assists search committees in attracting a diverse pool of candidates. Policy states that efforts must go beyond an advertisement in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. This office also has *Guidelines for Recruiting Women and Minority Faculty* and *Diversity Outreach Resources*. Additionally, a list of “talent banks” of potential candidates from diverse backgrounds is available.

New faculty reported that they came to CSUMB because of the mission of the university and the teacher education program. They also mentioned that they wished to work with candidates and students in the tri-county area and to work with first-generation college students. Finally, they reported that the Monterey Bay area was a desirable area in which to live.

C. Experiences Working With Diverse Candidates

CSUMB is located in a tri-county community that is very diverse with respect to ethnicity, racial, gender and socio-economics.

Monterey County is the largest of the three, with 400,000 residents; Santa Cruz County has ca. 250,000 residents and San Benito County's population is just over 50,000. Ethnically, White and Hispanic/Latino groups dominate the area. Whites comprise about 45% of the population of San Benito County, 56% of Monterey County, and 75% of Santa Cruz County; Hispanics/Latinos comprise about 27% of the population of Santa Cruz County, 47% of Monterey County, and 48% of San Benito County. The remaining population consists largely of "Other/Unknown" (20-30%), with smaller groups such as African-Americans (1-4%), Asian/Pacific Islander (2-6%), and American Indian/Alaska Native (1%). (Institutional Report, 2006)

The number of candidates enrolled in the initial programs tends to reflect distribution by percentage found in the community. The table below provides enrollment data that show the number of candidates enrolled in the initial programs for two semesters by program and ethnic group.

Table 10 Candidate Diversity - Initial Programs

Term	Subject	White	Latino/a	African American	Asian American	Native American/Alaskan	Pacific Islander	Other	No Response	Total
		Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count
Spring 2006	Multiple Subject	19	15		1		2	1	4	42
	Single Subject	18	9	1	1		1		7	37
	Special Education	54	26	2	2	2	5	2	22	115
Term Total		91	50	3	4	2	8	3	33	194
Fall 2005	Multiple Subject	16	8		1		2	1	6	34
	Single Subject	18	9	1	1				7	36
	Special Education	60	24	3	1	3	6	4	22	123
Term Total		94	41	4	3	3	8	5	35	193

Table 11 below provides data on the ethnic and racial break down of graduates in the advanced program from 1999-2006.

Table 11 Candidate Diversity - Advanced Program

	Number of MAE Degree C & I Strand	Number of MAE degrees SPED Strand
African American	4	1
European American	22	1
Hispanic/Mexican American	17	2
Asian/Asian American	7	0
Other International	5	0

Upon reviewing class syllabi it was determined that many classes implemented group assignments that required persons from different ethnic, racial and socio-economic and gender to work with each other to complete common class projects. Examples of class that required group project were *ED 616, 617, SPED 550, 560, 565, 561, 562 and 565*. Opportunities to work with diverse groups were confirmed during a group session with approximately 14 alumni when one person reported a testimonial that work was required with persons from different groups. However, it was indicated that the experience was valuable and provided him with valuable insights that assisted him with his current employment. Additionally, the alumni indicated that 100 percent of their classes required this kind of group work. The reviewers did not confirm 100 percent but acknowledge that ample opportunities were available for candidates to work with diverse candidates.

The unit is involved in a number of programs and activities that are designed to attract a diverse pool of candidates. During interviews with faculty and School of Education staff it was indicated that the School of Education participated in high school career days, attended the Naval Post Graduate recruitment program designed to attract dependents of naval personnel, set up booths at the local farmers market and managed several grants aimed at attracting a diverse pool of candidates. The following grants have been initiated and are currently under way:

- **Project Las Alianzas** established a “grow-you-own” teacher recruitment pipeline.
- **Project Manzana** focused on the development of campus life and future teacher residence hall.
- **Project Highly Qualified Avenue** is focusing on helping teachers of diverse backgrounds in Math, Science, and Special Education become exemplary, highly qualified teachers in these subjects in our service region.
- **ASSET-Aspiring Special Education Teachers-USDE** funded grant to provide support for teachers while they work in the schools.

Confirmation of these recruitment grants was identified in the documents room.

D. Experiences Working With Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

The candidate has extensive opportunities to work with linguistically and culturally diverse students in P-12 schools. The multiple subject and single subject programs require semester long practical training experiences in each of two semesters. The unit maintains a policy of placing candidates in classrooms where a minimum percentage of 25 percent English language learners are encountered. The unit has contracted partnerships with Pajaro Valley Unified, North Monterey County Unified, Monterey Peninsula Unified, and Salina City Elementary. Demographics of the students in the tri-county public school area are indicated below.

***Table 12 Demographics of Student in the Tri-County Public School Area of:
Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz***

American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4%
Asian	2.6%
Pacific Islander	0.9%
Filipino	2.9%
Hispanic or Latino	68.1%
African American	3.1%
White (not Hispanic)	20.3%
Multiple or No Response	1.7%

California leads most of the nation as a multilingual, multicultural society where no ethnic group constitutes a majority. The unit's mission focuses on the diversity and multicultural character of the tri-county area. The preparation programs have partnered with school districts that meet diversity requirements, ensuring candidates will experience linguistically and/or culturally diverse classrooms for placements. Interviews and observations convincingly attest to such diversified placements. Multiple and single subject programs require SPED 560 (Inclusionary Practices for Students with Special Needs), to gain exposure to special education environments. Based on the requirements, candidates are to visit two different sites where special services are rendered for one hour each and analyze the experience. As a signature assignment, candidates are required to design a lesson plan and teach a student with exceptionalities to complete the required coursework. If the candidate does not have such a child within his school setting, he/she is asked to create a scenario to complete the project. Interviews confirmed that exceptionality placement is by happenstance. Thus, the unit does not ensure that each candidate has at least one field experience with students with exceptionalities.

Advanced candidates are teachers who work in clinical settings in which they are hired by school districts and counties independent of the university. Therefore, the unit does not ensure the type of placement they are in or the setting in which the school is located. However, the advanced program is focused on multiculturalism, inclusion, and social justice. Most MAE candidates are drawn to the university based on their interest in working in settings characterized by diversity and special needs. In addition, the unit's location is in an area heavily characterized by multiculturalism, and the program draws candidates primarily from the three counties that comprise the area. For the Special Education strand, candidates are currently employed by partnership schools as Level II Education Specialists as a condition for acceptance into the program.

The unit offers two specific courses ED 560 (Inclusionary Practices for Students with Special Needs) and ED 612 (Pedagogy for Linguistic and Cultural Diversity) which are designed to impact dispositions, knowledge, and skills needed for success in the inclusive classroom. The unit contends this coursework, along with concurrent field experiences provide the candidate a thorough grounding to assure student success and to help all students learn. Interviews concurred with this information. Cooperating teachers feel candidates do have the knowledge-base to develop the skills and dispositions to meet the needs of all students. Composite surveys of teachers and employers indicate 79 percent of unit candidates are well/adequately prepared in their preparation for equity and diversity in the K-12 schools. However, there were no indicators as to their preparedness to teach students of exceptionalities.

Interviews echoed consistently that candidates reflect and receive feedback from their peers as well as supervisors and faculty, while working with diverse students. While no written evidence was found, it was observed and confirmed that candidates value their working relationship with the cooperating teacher, clinical supervisor, unit faculty, and their peers through reflection and feedback of experiences and written work.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The SOE has chosen diversity as one of the four commitments of the unit's conceptual framework. Candidates have experiences working with diverse higher education and school faculty, candidates, and students in P – 12 schools. The SOE has developed curricula to ensure candidates acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn as stated in the unit's conceptual framework, *Reflective Educators for Diverse Learners*. The unit does not ensure that all candidates in all programs have at least one field experience with students with exceptionalities. Review of assessments indicate, however, that most of the assessments are not designed in a way to yield data that can be used to provide feedback to candidates about the specific proficiencies that they are expected to develop during their professional program.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Areas for Improvement:

New

The unit does not ensure that each candidate has at least one field experience with students with exceptionalities.

Rationale

The unit does not ensure that each candidate has at least one field placement that provides the opportunity to work with diverse students including exceptionalities.

New

Assessment data are not used in a consistent manner to provide feedback to candidates to improve knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Rationale

Examination of fieldwork observation forms indicated that there is considerable variation in the quantity and quality of feedback from one fieldwork supervisor to another, suggesting not

all candidates receive the same level of support in attaining proficiency in working with diverse student populations.

State Team Decision: Standard Met with a Concern

Concern:

The unit does not ensure that each candidate, multiple and single subject, has at least one field placement with students with exceptionalities.

STANDARD 5. FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Qualified Faculty

Full-time faculty: CSUMB education unit consists of 12 full-time faculty members of which 12 hold doctoral degrees in education (100%). Ten faculty members hold professional credentials in addition to their doctorate degree (83%). All full-time faculty have expertise in the fields they oversee.

Part-time faculty: CSUMB Education Unit employs five adjunct faculty and seven Field Supervisors. Both are recruited and selected based upon their particular expertise. Adjunct faculty are highly qualified and the majority hold doctoral degrees; minimally they must possess a master's degree. They are hired to assist in teaching courses.

Field Supervisors must hold a master's degree and possess teaching credentials. They demonstrate high levels of professional expertise based on their years of exceptional experience as former school teachers and/or administrators. They are well known for their excellence and experience in public education.

One hundred percent of full-time faculty have contemporary professional experiences in P-12 classrooms. However, some have minimal active participation as they all carry full teaching loads. Full-time faculty serve as providers of in-service (professional development) for public schools and also serve on P-12 committees from a Tri-County area (Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz) thereby fulfilling contemporary professional experience.

B. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Faculty has a thorough understanding of the content they teach. Their advanced degrees and noted expertise were documented by multiple sources, including the Institutional Report (IR), the general catalog, website, and through interviews. Best practices were also made evident in the reading of individual faculty philosophies, websites, and syllabi.

Evidence demonstrates that program curriculum is mapped to the conceptual framework. Faculty responded to questions and cited examples of how their instruction reflects the conceptual framework of the School of Education. Elements of the conceptual framework are translated into specific student outcomes/products that display those proficiencies. Faculty also expressed how the conceptual framework helps them better focus on current issues/research.

Faculty have put candidate learning in the forefront of their commitment and responsibilities. Evidence gathered from interviews with students validated that the faculty spend time meeting with students for advising and discussing questions from coursework.

Based on course syllabi and faculty vitae it is evident that faculty use a variety of strategies, methods, and models that encompass diversity, reflection, critical thinking and problem solving. Faculty value candidates' learning and assess it with signature assignments from various courses. Commitment to technology is a university wide requirement that is also evident in all curriculum requirements.

Faculty use qualitative and quantitative assessments to assist in the self-assessment of teaching. Candidates expressed their opinions concerning the quality of their professors through faculty evaluation surveys. The evaluations documented how faculty teaching aids and encourages the student in the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions.

Candidates also report that they are coached as they practice and develop expertise. Candidates receive formative feedback on their efforts and are given ample time for successful completion of assignments.

C. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Faculty members are expected to conduct research and publish the findings of research. CSUMB incorporates scholarship with faculty evaluation. Faculty must be engaged in activities such as publishing books, publishing refereed journals, other publications, grant writing, and presentations (local, national, international). Scholarship is tied to evaluation but also it is recognized as a means to enhance ones teaching.

Faculty are engaged in all manner of scholarship. Evidence in the IR was substantiated by faculty vitae concerning the types of scholarship activities faculty were engaged and how it was tied to teaching and learning. Every faculty member is published (100%). Sixteen grants were written which generated \$18,914,000. CSUMB faculty participated in one hundred presentations (local, regional, state, national, and international combined).

D. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

The university strives to serve its local population, as put forth in its vision statement. The unit's conceptual framework states, *"The campus will be distinctive in serving the diverse people of California, especially the working class and historically under-educated and low-income populations...the identity of the university will be framed by a substantive commitment to a multilingual, multicultural, intellectual community distinguished by partnerships with existing institutions."*

Evidence supports that all faculty provide service to the department, university, public/charter schools, the local community, and the professional community. Education faculties are involved with several local school districts in collaboration and the development of curriculum. Faculties also serve as members of teacher workforce initiatives, members of tri-county level organizations that oversee education, and as members of P-12 school boards.

Types of service in P-12 schools include: Teacher Workforce Initiative (TWI) member; teacher recruitment presentations and credential advisement to community groups and individuals in the Tri-County area; Board Member for various school districts; member of San Jose Teaching Fellows; Teacher Education Advisory Council, California Foreign Language Project, University

of California Office of the President; Advisory Council, New Teacher Project; Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Steering Committee, Monterey County Office of Education; Curriculum Council, Monterey County Office of Education; Social Studies Teacher Advisory Committee, Monterey County Office of Education; National Boards Support Group (Support Provider), Monterey County Office of Education; Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Executive Committee, San Mateo Union High School District BTSA Program; Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Steering Committee, San Mateo County Office of Education BTSA Consortium; Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Consortium I Executive Committee, Santa Clara County Office of Education BTSA Consortium; and Research Review Committee Member, California Council for the Education of Teachers.

Evidence from faculty indicates that every faculty member participates in education related services at varying levels (local, state, national, and/or international). Examples include:

- Local: Treasurer, Member, Board of Directors, Vice-Chair in various organizations.
- University committees: Faculty Appeals, Faculty Development, Research Council, Academic Policies and Procedures, Faculty Senate, Retention Committee, Faculty Welfare Committee, Computer Utilization Committee, Field Experiences Committee, Departmental Committees, Elementary Education Committee, Special Education Committee, Assessment Committee, and Faculty Searches.
- State committees: Education Newsletter Editor, Teacher Education Council, and Goals 2000 Steering Committee.
- National committees: NCATE Steering Committee, Beta Sigma Iota advisor, and advisor for Council for Exceptional Children.

Faculty members (100%) are engaged in professional organizations according to their areas of expertise. While all are engaged as participants, some serve in administrative capacities for their professional organization. A few examples of organizations include: American Association of Higher Education, American Educational Research Association (AERA), American Society for Curriculum Development (ASCD), American Association for Educational Research (AAER), Association of American Colleges and Universities, California Council for the Education of Teachers (CCET), California Council for the Social Studies (CCSS), Council for Adult and Experiential Learning, Council for Exceptional Children, International Reading Association, International Society for Technology in Education, National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), and Phi Delta Kappa.

CSUMB sets a high standard in its institutional approach requiring Service Learning as a graduation requirement. One hundred percent of faculty model best professional practices in service.

E. Collaboration

A review of faculty vitae reveal the documented extent of collaboration in areas of publications, grant activities, P-12 education, and assisting the Tri-County schools in sharing ideas which enable them to work together in preparing teachers to meet the needs of the schools.

Collaboration with P-12 schools began in 1995 as each superintendent in Monterey County was invited to nominate participants to serve on the original CSUMB Collaborative Education Council. The P-12/community collaboration contributes significantly to the future directions of teacher education at CSUMB and is the formation of a number of university faculty search committees.

Faculty work directly with P-12 personnel who contribute directly to the teacher education programs by teaching classes, and/or by working as field supervisors. Teachers (P-12) actively serve as cooperating teachers and mentors for teacher candidates placed at their schools. Collaboration also takes place in annual meetings between the cooperating teachers and faculty.

Collaboration with the arts and sciences faculty is evident from active participation in the University-Wide Teacher Education Council (UTEC) whose primary functions are the evaluation of program effectiveness and the development of policies and resources for the improvement of teacher education. In addition to the UTEC, faculty work with arts and sciences faculty to develop or align courses that can be taken congruently (combining content with content pedagogy). There is considerable evidence that the education unit collaborated with the arts and sciences faculty in developing teaching methodology and curriculum courses for the education unit.

Collaboration has been exemplified through the Monterey Bay Education Consortium's Teacher Workforce Initiative, the Monterey County Office of Education Curriculum Council, and the California Internship Program in the Tri-County Region. Through these venues, members share ideas about the needs of today's schools, focusing on how they can work together to prepare teachers, improve candidate learning, and improve the future of education.

F. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Full-time faculty members are evaluated on a regular basis. Tenure-track faculty are evaluated every two years. Tenured faculty are evaluated every five years. The evaluation is a comprehensive look at the faculty members accomplishments in: (1) teaching and learning, (2) scholarly activities in teaching and education leadership, (3) research endeavors, and (4) service to the professional and local communities (as detailed in the university's personnel guidelines).

Part-time faculty members are evaluated at the end of each semester by teacher candidates (as they complete the course at the end of the class). Department chairs view the data and meet with faculty to review the findings. Part-time faculty are then evaluated on an annual calendar year basis.

Faculty evaluations are based on the Student Feedback on Instructor and Course Forms. Data confirms that faculty members are aligned with the conceptual framework and perform in the "very good to outstanding" level.

Results of evaluations are compiled and the data is made available for the faculty to use in improving the course and instruction. Department chairs also view the data and meet with faculty to review the findings. Faculty members are also evaluated on an annual calendar year basis.

Evaluations are coupled faculty development. Faculty are expected to assess evaluation data and plan for ways to improve teaching, scholarship, and/or service. When performance data does not improve, the faculty member is not retained.

G. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

The unit provides opportunities for both individual and committee professional development facilitation. Overall, professional development is designed to provide support and mentoring for junior faculty as they work towards securing tenure and promotion. Faculty are allocated \$400 per year for travel expenses to attend scholarly events. Refer to Standard 6.3, Personnel.

Faculty can request support and mentoring at any time. The unit provides equal opportunity for full-time faculty to participate in professional development activities. While each faculty member may generate \$400, the unit may disperse funds in various ways as agreed upon by the unit. Overall, professional development is designed to provide support for full-time faculty only.

Professional development is established and based on the needs of the faculty (individually and collectively). Faculty vitae collectively are aligned with the conceptual framework and mission of both the department and the institution.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Full-time faculty at CSUMB hold doctorate degrees. They are experts in their teaching field. They model best practices in scholarship with numerous publications being documented. Service to the community is a priority to all as documented by the many organizations and workshops they have partnerships with. Collaboration with colleagues is synthesized and evident in all aspects of curriculum. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates adequate professional development.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Areas for Improvement:

None

State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 6. UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Unit Leadership and Authority

Responsibility for programs leading to teacher credentialing in California rests with the Dean of the College of Professional Studies. This responsibility includes the general operation of the teacher education programs including planning, delivery, and evaluation. The dean reports directly to the provost/vice president for academic affairs.

The College of Professional Studies houses the School of Education and the School of Business. The School of Education includes the Teacher Education Department and the Liberal Studies Department. The Teacher Education Program includes the multiple subjects, single subjects, and special education credential programs as well as the Master of Arts in Education Program. There is a program coordinator for each of the credential programs and the Master of Arts in Education. The faculty and program coordinators of all credential programs report to the chair of the Department of Education. A faculty member in the Liberal Studies Department is the coordinator of the joint Ed.D. program in Educational Leadership. Additionally, there is a coordinator of field placement who is responsible for identification of field placements, hiring and supervision of clinical faculty, training of school-site faculty, and evaluation of clinical experiences of credential programs. There is no one assigned to coordinate assessment within the unit.

The Dean of the College of Professional Studies has recently been charged with coordination of campus-wide graduate programs. This will be in addition to his current duties.

A governance system for curricular changes begins at the faculty level. After approval of the program and departmental faculty, curricular issues are presented to the dean for approval. The course proposal is sent to the Faculty Senate where it is posted on a consent agenda. The faculty then have an opportunity to challenge or question the course. If there is no challenge it then is posted in course catalogs or on the university website.

The chair of the Department of Teacher Education meets regularly with coordinators of the credentialing and Masters programs to review information on operations including program and candidate assessment information.

A variety of committees serve the School of Education in several ways. The Council of Chairs is an advisory committee of department chairs to the dean. The Coordinators Council advises the chair of the Department of Education. The faculty serve on committees whose purpose is to advise and recommend actions pertaining to teacher education to the chair and dean. These include the following committees: College of Professional Studies, Department of Education, Retention and Promotion, Program Faculty, and Doctorate of Education.

The University Teacher Education Council (UTEC) was formed in 2003 to advise the provost/vice president for academic affairs and Dean of the College of Professional Studies on the operation and evaluation of the professional education program. The UTEC consists of the chairs of the Department of Teacher Education, Liberal Studies, and Health and Wellness, coordinators of the credential degree programs, students, community college representatives and three public school teachers. The UTEC also operates several standing committees including those dealing with program evaluation, curriculum, community service and development. The UTEC had been meeting once each semester but recently began a schedule of monthly meetings. A review of the minutes shows that topics covered in meetings included discussions on field placements, readiness of candidates for jobs, supporting beginning teachers, and reviewing data on program improvement efforts. The UTEC does not approve curricular items.

Candidates receive lower division advisement from the campus-wide advisement program. When a candidate expresses interest in teaching, they are provided an advisor in teacher education. In the 2003-2005 catalog, the Academic Support Programs describes how candidates can obtain lower division advising, obtaining information on programs such as tutoring, writing assistance, and career development assistance. Advisement services are not clearly noted in the 2005-2007 Abridged Catalog.

Brief statements about advisement are provided in the program overview for each credential program. Each candidate is provided an advisor who assists with course selection and complying with other program policies.

Counseling services are available to candidates through the Personal Growth and Counseling Center which provides crisis intervention, counseling, educational outreach programs and support groups.

CSUMB operates a website that provides information on general university information such as admissions, financial aid, and programs of study. The College of Professional Studies website has links to faculty, funded programs, district partners, financial aid, etc. Additionally, there is printed material including brochures, fact sheets, and postcards.

The information found on the website related to academic calendar, catalogs, publications and grading policies are accurate and current. The Abridged Catalog for 2006-2007 does not contain information on admissions, advisement, or support services for candidates.

B. Unit Budget

The California State University system is dependent on student fees and state funding. Recently, through a governor's initiative, a funding compact was formed. This compact is providing more stability for funding to the state university system. The operating budget for the teacher preparation program originates in the Chancellor's Office in Long Beach. This budget includes funds for operation of programs, grant funding, compensation budgeting, and special sources including lottery funds or recruitment funding. The distribution of these funds to the CSUMB academic programs involves the provost/vice president for academic affairs, deans, department chairs, and faculty. The provost/vice president for academic affairs uses the "Guiding Principles for Developing Budget Priorities" to decide the allocation of funds to the colleges. After deliberations with stakeholders, the dean of the College of Professional Studies allocates annual budget funds to departments in the college. Allocation is based on full-time equivalent student enrollment however, there are outside influences that may occur including reductions in operating budget or frozen positions.

Over the past five years, funding for the California State University system has been reduced. The academic programs at CSUMB have been protected from significant cuts and reductions were taken from other parts of the university. The teacher education budget was at a high of \$1,162,062 in 2003-04 and for the 2005-06 year the funding was \$1,060,639. However, the teacher education budget allocation is larger than any other unit in the College of Professional Studies. The teacher education budget provides for \$7,482 per FTE. Additionally, due to a large private gift to the university, the teacher education program was able to hire an additional faculty member in the area of reading and literacy.

Funds from the Office of the Provost/Vice-President of Academic Affairs are provided to each dean to distribute to department heads for faculty travel. This year teacher education faculty have been provided \$400 for professional travel. The Center for Teaching, Learning and Assessment supports faculty by providing opportunities to apply for additional funding for travel and research. Faculty can receive assistance in promoting the University Learning Requirements and the Major Learning Outcomes. This occurs through faculty cooperatives and mini-grants on topics such as developing syllabi, mentoring and teaching portfolios.

Other than the designated faculty to be hired as a result of the private gift, the teacher education department has not been able to hire new faculty due to static or declining budget. Additionally, there are limited resources to begin any new initiatives or credential programs.

C. Personnel

Full time faculty members are assigned 15 weighted teaching units for each semester. This includes instruction, advisement, scholarship, and service to the university and the community. Twelve of the 15 units are allocated to instruction including supervision.

Faculty who are engaged in activities such as department chair, coordinator, or administrative duty assignments and grants may receive reduced instructional load duties. The deans and department heads have flexibility in faculty assignments as long as the 24 teaching units per year per faculty are met.

There are no distinctions between graduate and undergraduate faculty in terms of teaching load. All faculty teach the same amount of weighted teaching units. The clinical faculty including full-time and adjunct are assigned candidates to supervise with the following ratios:

Table 13 Supervision Ratio for Clinical Faculty

Level of field experience	Number of candidates	Number of teaching units
Stage I	3	1
Stage II	2	1
Interns—first semester	2	1
Interns—second semester	3	1

The total number of candidates a faculty or supervisor could supervise during a semester would be 24. This information was not verifiable in print.

The CSU system mandates that faculty teach 15 teaching units each semester. Three of these are used for service, scholarship, and advising. In addition to these hours faculty receive \$400 for travel to support scholarship. These funds come from the Office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs to the dean, and then to the departments. Departments decide how the money will be distributed. Faculties are also encouraged to use the Center for Teaching, Learning and Assessment for additional funding and assistance in their scholarship efforts. First year faculty are typically given a reduced teaching load during their first semester.

The Department of Teacher Education uses 12 part-time teaching faculty and seven field supervisors. The department head or coordinators meet with part time faculty to discuss the conceptual framework, syllabi development and to ensure that part-time faculty are consistent with the unit's mission and goals. Part-time faculty report that they are invited to give input into program issues and they often attend department meetings. They are notified by email or phone if there are immediate issues. They report understanding and using the conceptual framework through coursework and supervision.

The support personnel consist of eight staff members. These persons include a credential analyst, coordinator of field placement, Teacher Quality Enhancement grant staff, and four support staff who assist in various ways in the teacher education programs. The staff are knowledgeable about unit operations including practices, policies, and operations of the unit.

D. Unit Facilities

The facilities on the CSUMB campus are adequate for teaching and learning. There are technology work stations in each classroom that are used for instruction. In the science and mathematics building there are several classrooms that have computers available for each candidate.

The library is small with limited computer stations for candidate use. There are inadequate stack space and study rooms. Library faculty offices are also housed in the library. Candidates and faculty can use the interlibrary loan process through the California State University system. This is at no cost to faculty or candidates.

E. Unit Resources Including Technology

The teacher education faculty have obtained four federal grants and a private gift to support programs. These include *Las Alianzas* (grow your own teacher recruitment program), *Project Manzana* (partnership with 8 community colleges and two high schools for teacher recruitment), *Highly Qualified Avenue* Project (to bring continuity to partner institutions to train high quality teachers), *Preparing Minority Special Educators in Field-Based Settings with Supportive Technology* (to fully certified special education teachers) and *the Center for Reading Diagnosis and Instruction* (provide reading services to community youth and families). Due to the nature of these awards the teacher education program has realized an increase in candidate applications particularly in the area of special education. The Reading Center will continue to operate from an endowment.

The Information Technology services CSUMB provide support for faculty and candidates. The Center for Academic Technologies assists faculty with the use of instructional tools and resources such as Macromedia Breeze (web-based meetings), Tegrity (video and audio Power

Point presentations), Turnitin (academic integrity tool), Respondus (tool for creating and managing exams) for faculty use.

Candidates have technology such as email, internet, Blackboard, the use of digital cameras, camcorders, audiotape recorders and laptop computers for their use on campus or in their field experiences.

Faculty state and observations confirm that faculty use a variety of technologies in their teaching. Some candidates (primarily undergraduate) report using technology in their campus work and in their field-based experiences.

There are resources available for the collection of data on candidates and the program. The credentials analyst uses the Filemaker Pro database and the California Title II reporting system. The system monitors enrollment, clinical training hours, and candidate performance on program exit examinations.

The current library is small with limited computer stations for candidate use. There are inadequate stack space and study rooms. A separate curriculum library is not available for teacher education candidates. There are some state mandated textbooks and children's literature on the shelves. There are no curriculum kits available as they are old and have not been processed.

A new library is being built (Tanimura and Antle Family Memorial Library) and the plans are to open in December in 2008. The original plans have been scaled back due to budget allocation from the Chancellor's office. The library will be appropriate for 6500 candidates. Many Student Services offices will be housed in the library. The current library contains over 13,000 journals and other serials, a variety of electronic data bases, over 60,000 books, and over 1000 videotapes and DVDs.

In the past there have been off campus courses but at the present time there are none being offered.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The College of Professional Studies is responsible for administering the teacher education program at California State University, Monterey Bay. There is an adequate budget allocation for the unit and unit facilities to meet the unit's needs. Offices and classrooms are well-equipped. There is adequate technology for both candidates and faculty. Faculty teaching loads are not differentiated between graduate and undergraduate courses. Supervision loads could be above 18 candidates per semester.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Areas for Improvement:

New

The faculty in the unit assigned to teach courses in advanced programs have teaching loads that exceed nine units per semester.

Rationale:

There is no delineation in teaching load in the unit for teaching assignments at undergraduate and graduate levels.

New

Supervision of clinical practice may exceed 18 candidates per full-time equivalent faculty member.

Rationale:

Full-time faculty and supervisors may contractually supervise up to twenty-four candidates per semester.

Internship Issues for State Team Report:**Common Standards 1 and 2 – Leadership and Resources**

The School of Education has an official agreement with each school district in which an intern is employed. Each district provides each intern with a support provider and additional resources.

Common Standard 4 – Evaluation

The University Teacher Education Council (UTEC) oversees and coordinates teacher education programs for the School of Education in collaboration with the Council of Chairs. Each program has a community advisory board consisting of program faculty and staff and school district personnel. The community advisory board serves as the primary liaison between the departments and the school district that participate in internship programs.

Common Standard 5 – Admission

Admission of intern candidates is coordinated by the Credential Analyst Office and with program coordinators. Each internship program evaluates candidates to make certain that they meet admission criteria.

Common Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance

Once accepted, intern candidates are met with on a regular basis and given program information which details requirements and deadlines as well as course information for which the intern must enroll during the first semester of the program. During the supervised fieldwork regularly scheduled meetings are held with the interns. There are multiple opportunities for interns to obtain assistance and advice.

Common Standard 7 – School Collaboration

Administrators at the school site and the university program coordinator complete the selection process for all site support providers.

PROGRAM STANDARDS
Multiple Subject Credential
Multiple Subject Internship Credential
Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis Credential

Single Subject Credential
Single Subject Internship Credential

Findings on Standards

After review of Multiple and Single Subject Program Documents, the Institutional Reports, supporting documentation, school site visitations, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all Program Standards for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject, including Internship programs, are met, except some are met with concerns:

Multiple Subject Standard 8A (c) and 8A (d) Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Multiple Subject (MS) Candidates - Standard Met with Concerns

History-Social Science/Visual and Performing Arts

The program's course, ED 615, Social Studies and Visual and Performing Arts Methods, combines the CA Subject Matter Content Standards for History-Social Science, K-8, and Visual and Performing Arts. Candidates are mandated to "illustrate history-social science through hands-on methods that integrate the visual and performing arts and provide active learning."

Concern

There is a concern that combining History-Social Science content and analysis skills and Visual and Performing Arts content and analysis skills diminishes attention to both key and important content areas for candidate development of content area knowledge and content pedagogy. Careful monitoring is needed to ensure depth and breadth of knowledge for these respective content areas in the curriculum and for the use of appropriate pedagogies to enhance student learning.

Single Subject Standard 8B(c) Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single-Subject (SS) Candidates: History-Social Science - Standard Met with Concerns

The courses, ED 605, Curriculum and Instruction in the Secondary Content Area, Part I, Social Studies, and ED 606, Curriculum and Instruction in the Secondary Content Area, Part II, Social Studies, focus on "lesson planning and unit planning to the standards outlined in the CA History-Social Science Framework . . ." and standards-based lessons. Program information suggests that lessons include current events, discussions, controversial issues, the importance of religion [in history] without bias, and actively involving students. Additionally, assessment should be addressed, and candidates should incorporate skills in reading and language arts, for instance, into lessons. Candidates' expectations include an end-of-course portfolio and Capstone presentation.

Upon examination of candidate portfolios, the team members determined that some of the portfolios had inconsistent organization. There is a concern that candidates know about appropriate use of copyright protected materials. The “signing off” of the portfolio, indicating that it was complete, did not ensure consistently that candidates met all criteria stipulated in the Portfolio Outline.

The examination and use of primary sources as a critical skill may be absent in both History/Social Sciences and English/Language Arts methods courses.

Multiple and Single Subject Standard 14(f) Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom - Standard Met with Concerns

The programs have stated that they place “great value” on identifying and selecting “the most desirable settings” for completion of candidate fieldwork competencies in both Stages I and II of their credential program. As evidenced by examination of assigned responses within candidates’ portfolios, Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates adequately address Program Standard 14 (a-e) in completing SPED 560, Inclusionary Practices for Students with Special Needs.

Concern

Site visitations and candidate interviews indicated that placement of Multiple and Single Subject candidates in general education classrooms does not necessarily ensure that all candidates have classroom experiences with students with special needs so that they can experience first-hand curricular, pedagogical, and assessment needs for these students.

Multiple and Single Subject Standard 16(c,e,f) Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors - Standard Met with Concerns

The programs stipulated nine general criteria for the selection of Multiple Subject/Single Subject cooperating teachers. Program Standard 16(c) requires that these criteria be clearly outlined and consistently followed when selecting teachers to supervise field experiences.

Concerns

As a result of site visitations and interviews with candidates, these criteria are not consistently followed at all sites. Of greatest concern is time spent in class by cooperating teachers of Stage I candidates in modeling classroom management and instructional strategies, as well as the selection of and rationale for using a variety of instructional resources.

Program Standard 16 (e-f) focuses on the requirements for professional development opportunities to be provided by the University, in cooperation with school administrators. Additionally, professional development for supervising teachers is to be provided by qualified staff in accordance with specific criteria outlined in the Program Standards document.

The team did not find evidence to substantiate that meaningful and quality professional development opportunities are available and/or accessed by all cooperating supervisors and appropriate school professionals.

Multiple and Single Subject Program Standard 18 (b) Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments During the Program - Standard Met with Concerns

The course, ED 617, Language and Literacy Development across the Curriculum II, requires that Multiple Subject candidates plan and teach language arts focused multidisciplinary thematic units using multicultural literature. Candidates are to demonstrate knowledge of assessment and ability to adapt to the particular needs of students with special needs. In ED 615, Social Studies and Visual and Performing Arts, candidates also plan, teach and evaluate an interdisciplinary thematic unit for Social Studies and Visual and Performing Arts. Lessons are to be video taped, analyzed, and presented as a Capstone Presentation.

Concern

In the examination of candidate portfolios, the team found limited evidence that the videotape assessment component of the Capstone project had been completed, or represented by a transcript, for all candidates.

Program Strengths:

The faculty members are highly knowledgeable and committed to teacher education.

The mission of the program is commendable, particularly as it serves to complement the university's mission and the university's presence in central California and its commitment to serve the people of the area. Candidates also commented on faculty members' attention to them. Their accessibility, care, and concern for candidates are qualities that are most evident. There is personal attention to candidates' growth and development as teachers. There is productive collaboration among arts and sciences and education faculty in preparing candidates for the single subject as well as for liberal studies fields. The service learning requirement for undergraduates is commendable. Faculty members are active in the community in a variety of ways to provide expertise and service to the community and the profession.

While it is a credit to the programs, given their emphasis on social justice and equity, that all Multiple and Single Subject candidates are required to complete SPED 560, Inclusionary Practice, the course provides candidates with background knowledge to serve children with special needs in mainstreamed classrooms. However, as noted above, there needs to be more application of competencies learned in field experiences.

The Portfolio Project and Capstone Presentation are characterized as the cornerstone of the organization in the Multiple and Single Subject programs and Intern programs. Students recognized these projects as ultimately highly worthwhile and rewarding experiences.

Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Level I
Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Level I with Internship
Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Level II

Education Specialist, Moderate/Severe Disabilities, Level I
Education Specialist, Moderate/Severe Disabilities, Level I with Internship
Education Specialist, Moderate/Severe Disabilities, Level II

Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate Disabilities and Moderate/Severe Disabilities, Level I and II and Internships

Based on the Institution's responses to Program Standards, interviews with faculty, staff, graduates, interns, current students in the credential programs and Internship, employers, cooperating teachers and other support providers the team finds all standards are met for the Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate and Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Level I and Level II credential programs. All standards are met for the Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, Level I with Internship and Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, Level I with Internship.

The Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, Level I program was approved in 2001 with Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, Level II approved a year later. The Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, Level I program was approved in 2003 with Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, Level II approved in 2005. In addition, both Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate with Internship and Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe with Internship were subsequently approved. Three hundred and seventy students are currently enrolled in the programs that are offered, and fifty-seven are in the Level I Internship Program. While recommending students for credentials serving the entire state, most candidates come from the tri-county area of Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz. With a total population of over 700,000 residents, the K-12 student population is primarily White, Hispanic and Asian.

Faculty are highly qualified and committed to best practices in teacher preparation and special education. They share their knowledge and expertise on a variety of national, state and local committees and advisory councils. Faculty members maintain successful relationships with County Offices of Education, Special Education Local Planning Areas and school sites. The programs are evaluated and the findings are used to inform program practices. The faculty assists other programs within the unit in developing the overall knowledge base of the unit relative to issues such as behavior management and adaptation of curriculum for students with disabilities.

While the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Level I and II programs are two distinct programs and the faculty have found some common benefit from providing blended coursework, there are some concerns with this model. With the growth of the program, the possibility exists that uniqueness of both programs may be difficult to maintain.

Strengths:

1. The primary strength in the program is the committed faculty. They seek to ensure their candidates are competent practitioners initially, who develop and renew their skills over the course of their careers.

2. The commitment of the program staff to the overall unit is evident. The faculty model their belief in inclusive education through their individual practices.
3. The commitment to the tri-county area is apparent in the development of a program leading the certificate examination offer by the Behavior Analyst Certification Board, founding a chapter of the Council of Exceptional Children, being awarded an ASSET Grant, the founding of the Reading Center, support for an annual Reading Conference, workshops including reading and behavior provided to support the professional development of all teachers in district and County Offices of Education placements. The program has helped to address a tangible need that has existed throughout the CSUMB service area.

Professional Comments:

Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs

The programs might consider a redesign of the Capstone presentation not only for candidate assessment and program assessment, but also for long-term opportunities for professional growth and development as candidates continue in their teaching positions.

Education Specialist Credential Programs

While students entering the programs at common entry points such as the Fall semester or from another CSUMB program report that they receive excellent advisement, those entering at less traditional points or who come from other institutions report receiving conflicting information. Effort should be made to ensure advisement is uniform across points of entry into the program.

Education Specialist Credential Programs

Some students reported receiving confusing information about the process for requesting a leave of absence. *Student Handbooks* should be reviewed to ensure they contain concise information about the process for both requesting a leave and for re-entering the program.

For All Programs

The programs are to be commended for initiating the needed valid and reliable assessment process for candidates in the special education program. It is recommended that this process continue to full fruition in realizing the recommendations provided by the Team.